This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE BEQUEST OF

ISAAC MYER

RECEIVED FEBRUARY 1904

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY.
ASTOR, LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

If it be enquired how any one can possibly be an Atheist at this time of day, ag^st so great Light & Conviction, such Evidence & Demonstration of all sorts both from Reason & Revelation? I answer, tis strange indeed; but there is no disputing ag^st matter of Fact. There are some men who openly declare war ag^st Heaven, & make it their Business & Profession to dispute God out of ye world as well as their own thoughts: There are others who will not plainly say so but yet believe & persuade themselves in their own hearts that there is no God as much as ye former; And such mens thoughts, tho they will not speak them out, may be as easily discerned by their works & actions, as ye Tree by its Fruits or ye Fountain by its Stream or any Natural Cause by ye genuine Effects that necessarily & constantly flow from it. many men have assigned divers Reasons, but I think they may all be reduced to this one viz. The great Irregularity of mens lives & ye constant Opposition of their Wills to ye Will of God. There are some sins wch by a natural Influence and Operation so debase ye Soul & vitiate ye understanding, that the discerning Faculty becomes unable to perform its proper office or judge aright ~~any~~ about things of a Spiritual Nature: As he that immerged in Lust & Sensual Pleasures, becomes wholly chained to Sensible & Material Objects, and all his Notions & Idea's partake of ye nature of ye things he has been so long accustomed to

ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ;

OR, THE

ANTIQUITIES

OF

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

AND

OTHER WORKS,

OF THE

REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

Formerly Fellow of University College, Oxford; and afterwards Rector of Headbourn Worthy, and Havant, Hampshire;

WITH A

SET OF MAPS OF ECCLESIASTICAL GEOGRAPHY,

TO WHICH ARE NOW ADDED,

SEVERAL SERMONS,

AND OTHER MATTER, NEVER BEFORE PUBLISHED,

The whole Revised and Edited, together with

A Biographical Account of the Author,

BY HIS GREAT GRANDSON,

THE REV. RICHARD BINGHAM, B.C.L.

Prebendary of Chichester, Vicar of Hale Magna, Incumbent of Gosport Chapel, and formerly fellow of New College, Oxford.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.—VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR WILLIAM STRAKER,

443, WEST STRAND.

MDCCCXXXIV.

236380

TO THE

MOST REVEREND AND RIGHT HONOURABLE

His Grace

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,

(Dr. William Howley.)

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE;

HAVING completed this new edition of the Works of my revered Ancestor, I was anxious to send it forth to the World under the patronage of some eminent character. To whom therefore could I so properly look, as to the highest Dignitary of our Church; with the history, discipline, and doctrines of which the following volumes are so closely connected? And I entreat your Grace to allow me to add, that I was more especially led to desire permission to send out this edition under you Grace's sanction, by the remembrance of our having passed together, as companions and friends, in the same class, and during the same years, through Wickham's Colleges both at Winchester and Oxford.

But while I mean only to thank your Grace for having so kindly complied with my request, and accompanied that consent with the valuable statement, that "my celebrated Great Grandfather's writings have long since received the approbation of Divines and Scholars;" I will not forget the latter part of your Grace's letter, in which you desire, that I would confine myself "to a simple inscription, and without compliments." I hope I shall not be considered guilty of disobeying that injunction by saying, that your Grace's amiable virtues are too universally acknowledged to require any testimony from so humble an individual as I am; instead of which, may it please your Grace, with your usual condescension and goodness, to accept this offering from me as a mark of my high esteem and respect.

That Providence may be pleased to bestow on your Grace, for many years to come, life and health to promote the interests of our Church and Nation, shall be among the prayers of him, who has the honour to be

Your Grace's

obliged and most obedient servant,

RICHARD BINGHAM.

New-House, Gosport, 26 February, 1829.

THE LIFE

OF THE

REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM,

BY THE EDITOR.

THE learned Author of the ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, and of the other Theological Tracts, which are now offered to the Public in an uniform and complete edition, was born in September, 1668, at Wakefield, in Yorkshire, of which place his father, Mr. Francis Bingham, was a respectable inhabitant. He was taught the first rudiments of grammar at a school in that town, under Mr. Edward Clarke, and on the 26th of May, 1684, he was admitted a member of University-College, in Oxford. During his academical residence he applied with persevering industry to those studies, which are generally considered as most laborious. Though he by no means neglected the writers of Greece and Rome, yet he

employed the greater portion of his time in studying the writings of the Fathers, making himself intimately acquainted with their opinions and doctrines, and fully able both to explain, and to defend, their interpretation of the difficult or disputed passages of Scripture. With what earnestness he devoted his mind to these abstruse inquiries, he had an early opportunity of giving an honourable testimony, which will presently be mentioned more at large. He took the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1688; and on the first of July, 1689, was elected a fellow of the before-mentioned College, and his election to that fellowship was attended with some flattering marks of distinction. On the 23d of June, 1691, he took the degree of Master of Arts, and was appointed one of the tutors of the College.* In that situation he paid particular attention to the instruction of a young man, whom he had brought from Wakefield and introduced at the University, and who, soon after Mr. Bingham's election to a fellowship, was by his means chosen scholar of the same foundation, to which he himself belonged. This was Mr. John Potter, who afterwards became Archbishop of

* For these particulars and many others in this relation I was some years ago indebted to the condescending attention of Dr. Wetherell, the late Master of University-College, Oxford, who in the most obliging manner took the trouble of examining the Records of his College, and other documents in the University, and from thence gave me much assistance and information.

Canterbury. Mr. Potter's first tutor happening to die, when he was no more than two years standing in the University, Mr. Bingham took his young friend and townsman under his own wing; and to his having given some general directions to his studies, which it is probable therefore would have a similarity to those he pursued himself, it is reasonable to suppose we owe that excellent book, "Potter on Church Government," and perhaps also "Potter's Antiquities of Greece." About four years after Mr. Bingham had taken his Master's degree a circumstance occurred, which eventually occasioned him to leave the University. At that time controversies ran high among learned men concerning the true explanation of what is termed, the Trinity; the manner in which that doctrine had been understood or maintained by the primitive Fathers; and what they meant by Ὀυσια and *Substantia*. Mr. Bingham being called on in his turn, as a Master of Arts, to preach before the learned body, of which he was a member; and having heard, what he conceived to be a very erroneous statement on that subject, delivered by a leading man from the pulpit at St. Mary's, thought it his duty not to let the occasion, which then offered, escape him of evincing publicly his intimate acquaintance with the opinions and doctrines of the Fathers, and of displaying at the same time the zeal and perseverance, with which he was resolved to defend their tenets, concerning the

Trinity, in opposition to the unjust attacks of men, who, though inferior to him in learning, were in much more elevated stations than that which he filled. In pursuance of this determination he delivered a long and learned discourse in the University-Church on the 28th of October, 1695, taking for his text those famous words of the Apostle; "There are three that bear record in "Heaven: the Father, the Son, and the Holy "Ghost, and these three are one." This sermon, though containing nothing more than an elaborate exposition and defence of what the Fathers had asserted to be the true, ancient, and ecclesiastical notion of the term Person, in opposition to what he deemed the novel and heterodox explanation of it, which he had lately heard given, drew on the learned preacher a very heavy censure from the ruling members of the University, charging him with having asserted doctrines false, impious, and heretical, contrary and dissonant to those of the Catholic Church.* This censure was followed by other charges in the public prints; wherein he was accused of Arianism, Tritheism, and the heresy of Valentinus Gentilis. These matters

* That such a censure was passed, by means of the commanding influence in the University of the preceding preacher, is most certain, no less from domestic tradition of the circumstance, than from the mention, which is repeatedly made of it in the manuscript papers of our Author. But I am assured that no traces thereof are now to be found in the books of the University.

ran so high, and the party against him was so powerful, that he found himself under the necessity of resigning his fellowship on the 23d of November, 1695, and of withdrawing from the University. How wholly unmerited these accusations were, not only appears from the sermon itself, now in my possession, and which it is my intention to publish in the last volume of this edition, but also from the whole tenor of his life and writings, in both and all of which he constantly proved himself to be a zealous and devout defender of what is called the orthodox notion of the Trinity. Immediately on the resignation of his fellowship Mr. Bingham was presented, without any solicitation on his part, by the famous Dr. Radcliffe, one of the most liberal benefactors to the University of Oxford, to the Rectory of Headbourn-Worthy, a living valued at that time at about one hundred pounds a year, and situated at a little more than a mile from Winchester. Within a few months after his settling in the country, being called on to preach at a visitation, held on the 12th of May, 1696, in Winchester Cathedral, he seized that opportunity of pursuing the subject, which he had begun at Oxford, and of exculpating himself from those heavy charges, which had been so unjustly brought against him; and which, according to his own words, " if true, were enough " to give all wise and sober men a just abhorrence " of any one, who had merited them." That my

revered ancestor had in no degree deserved those imputations in the opinion of his brethren, before whom he preached, may by the strongest deductions of reason be concluded from his having, at no greater distance of time than the 16th of September, 1697, been again appointed to preach before them on a similar occasion. He then brought to a conclusion, what he wished to say further on that subject, his manner of treating which had exposed him to the censure of the University; and having done so he prepared to commit the three sermons to the press. Why this intention was not fulfilled I cannot discover from any of his papers; but on the other hand I find among them a long preface to the sermon preached at Oxford, explaining and justifying his motives both for having preached and published it, and a second preface annexed to the first of those preached at Winchester, in which he dedicates the two visitation sermons to the clergy of the deanery, before whom they were delivered; and therein he tells them, that he has been induced to do so, not only from the subject contained in them being such as was their immediate concern, but also that he might have an opportunity of giving a more full account of the motive and circumstances, which had occasioned him to write or publish them. These prefaces contain also very long and learned additional statements corroborative of what Mr. Bingham had in his sermons asserted concerning the

opinions of the Fathers. But as it is my intention to publish the whole of these sermons, with the prefaces of the writer, in the concluding volume of this edition, it would be useless to enter here into any further comment or explanation respecting them. Thus much, however, it has appeared to me proper to say, in the commencement of the biographical account of this eminent divine, lest a censure of any sort, though every trace of it is now expunged from their records, having been passed by those, who were at that time leading characters in a great and learned University, might at first view be considered as a blot in the character of one, who, not only by the still existing testimony of all his writings, but also by every account, which has been handed down from his parishioners, or his own immediate family, was both in his private life, and in his literary pursuits, in his morality, disposition, and religious tenets, irreproachable and exemplary. About six years after our Author had taken up his residence at Worthy, he married Dorothea, one of the daughters of the Rev. Richard Pococke,* at that time rector of Colmere, in Hampshire. By this lady, in the course of a few years, and before he had any other preferment than the small living abovementioned, he became the father of ten children,

* Grandfather of the Right Rev. Richard Pococke, Bishop of Ossory, Author of "THE DESCRIPTION OF THE EAST," &c.

two sons and eight daughters. Yet neither did he suffer the rapid increase of his family, nor the consequent narrowness of his finances, to depress his spirits, or impede the progress of his studies. On the contrary, he appears to have applied to his literary pursuits with a closer and more persevering industry; and by those means, in the course of what cannot be considered as a long life, he was enabled to complete in his country retirement, besides several other single volumes, the following learned and laborious work, ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ;—the first volume of which he published in 1708, and it pleased Providence to spare his life, till he had brought his useful and arduous undertaking to a perfect and full conclusion. He committed the tenth and last volume to the press in 1722, and died in August, 1723. Of the great difficulties, with which my learned progenitor had to contend in the prosecution of his labours, he speaks in several parts of his works in such pointed terms, as cannot but excite both our sympathy and regret. He had to struggle, he tells us, with an infirm and sickly constitution, and constantly laboured under the greatest disadvantages for want of many necessary books, which he had no opportunity to see, and no ability to purchase. At the same time, he does not omit to express his gratitude to Providence, which had so placed him, that he could have recourse to a very

excellent library,* though even that was deficient in many works, to which he had occasion to refer. Yet, when we turn to the *Index Auctorum* at the end of his great work, we shall perhaps be astonished at the vast number of writers, which he appears to have consulted. That he was greatly distressed for books, we learn from his own words as above stated. A circumstance, however, more expressive of this fact than any assertion can possibly be, deserves to be mentioned in this place, because it furnishes rather a singular, and certainly very striking proof of the confined circumstances, and his consequent inability to purchase books, under which this good and learned divine continually laboured. I have in my possession a folio edition of Dr. Pearson's Exposition of the Creed, which belonged, in a torn and imperfect state, to the Author of ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ, and has had what was deficient in it restored by him with much care and trouble. It contains eight whole pages most neatly and accurately transcribed with his own hand. Such was his great want of books, and the extreme narrowness of his circumstances, that he was reduced, we see, to the necessity of employing several hours of that time, of which, comparatively speaking, so

* The library of the Cathedral Church at Winchester, being a very valuable collection bequeathed to the Dean and Chapter of that Church, by the renowned Bishop Morley, for the use of the parochial clergy, and to promote their advancement in learning.

small a portion was allotted him, and which he could so ill spare from more intense and useful studies, in the tedious and irksome task of transcribing many whole folio pages to supply the deficiencies of a mutilated book, of which a complete copy might have been purchased for a few shillings. In addition to the inconvenience he experienced for want of books, the progress of his studies was much impeded, as indeed we have already mentioned, by the weakness and infirmities of his constitution. In the concluding page of the last volume of his ORIGINES, we find him lamenting the state of his health in the following words: "Another Book more of miscellaneous rites might "be added; but having laboured in this work for "twenty years with frequent returns of bodily in-"firmities, which make hard study now less "agreeable to a weakly constitution, and the "things themselves being of no great moment, I "rather choose to give the reader a complete and "finished work with an index to the whole, than "by grasping at too much to be forced to leave it "imperfect, neither to my own nor the world's "satisfaction." Nor were these the only discouraging circumstances, with which this worthy man had to contend. He was surrounded, as we have already mentioned, with a family of ten children, and met with a very late and small patronage to reward him for his great literary labours, or to enable him to pursue them with comfort or con-

venience. He had, it is true, on his leaving Oxford been presented by Dr. Radcliffe to the small living of Headbourn-Worthy. But neither did his great learning, nor his other excellent qualifications as a divine obtain him any other preferment for many years. At length, in 1712, Sir Jonathan Trelawney, at that time Bishop of Winchester, collated him to the rectory of Havant, a few miles from Portsmouth. In justice, however, to the memory of Dr. Charles Trimnell, the immediate successor of Sir Jonathan Trelawney, I ought not to omit mentioning, that it was the declared intention of that prelate to have nominated this learned divine to the first prebend, which might become vacant in the Cathedral Church of Winchester. This intention so honourable to his Lordship's discernment, and so strongly evincing his love of learning, was, if I may be allowed the expression, *doubly* prevented by death, as the Bishop, having presided over the see of Winchester only two years, died on the same day, on which it will be hereafter seen Mr. Bingham departed. The possession of the living of Havant, together with the small sums, which he was continually receiving from the sale of his works, seemed to have removed in some degree the narrowness of his circumstances. But this pleasing prospect, in the course of a few years, wholly disappeared; for just as he had realized, by the sale of his learned works, a sum sufficient to remove any un-

easiness from his mind respecting the maintenance of his widow and numerous family in the event of his decease, it pleased Providence to put his Christian resignation to a severe trial, by depriving him at one blow of all the profits, which he had reaped from the incessant toil and study, to which more than half his life had been devoted. Nearly, if not quite the whole of these hardly earned gains was suddenly torn from him, in 1720, by what was then metaphorically termed the bursting of the South-sea bubble. Yet such was the tranquillity of his disposition, such his piety and resignation, that this heavy loss did not appear to make the smallest impression on him, or for a single day to interrupt his important studies. I have the evidence of his own manuscripts to prove, that he pursued his valuable literary labours with unchanged and indefatigable zeal, and almost without intermission to the very close of his existence. Though only a few months elapsed between the publication of the last volume of ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ and his death, yet in the course of that short time he not only proposed to himself, but had actually prepared materials for the prosecution of several other useful and laborious works. We find him, in the preface to his tenth volume, recommending to any young men of learning and application, who might have opportunity of examining books the writing of several works, which he conceived would conduce to the improvement

of ecclesiastical knowledge; and the only objection, which could be offered against such undertakings, he thought himself an example sufficient to confute. "The great objection against all "these things is," he observes, "that each of "them is too great an undertaking for any single "person. I remember to have heard of the same "objection made by some against me and my "Origines, upon publishing the first volume of "them. I bless God, I have lived to confute the "objection, and give the world a proof, that great "and laborious works are not always so frightful "as sometimes they are imagined. I have given "a little specimen of what the industry of a single "person may do, in whom there is neither the "greatest capacity, nor the strongest constitution. "And, having made the experiment myself, I can "with more decency and freedom recommend "these things to others, who are qualified to un-"dertake them." In the same preface he promises, if God should be pleased to give him better health, to endeavour to effect some of those works himself. And accordingly, among his manuscript papers, there are many collections relative to those important subjects. His chief attention, however, during the short remainder of his life, appears to have been directed towards making preparations for a new edition of his ORIGINES. With this view he inserted many manuscript observations, and additional notes, in a set of his ANTIQUI-

TIES, which he preserved for his own use, from which the present edition of his works is in the course of publication. But from fulfilling this intention and all other employments he was prevented by death. His constitution, which was naturally extremely weak and delicate, could not be otherwise than much impaired by such a persevering and unremitted course of laborious studies, and by a life, in consequence of those studies, wholly recluse and sedentary. These circumstances combined brought upon him, at comparatively an early period of life, all the symptoms and infirmities of very advanced age. So much indeed was his whole system decayed for some considerable time before he died, that his dissolution at no very distant period being clearly foreseen, both by himself and friends, it was settled between the then Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Charles Trimnell, and himself, that he should resign Havant to enable his Lordship to appoint some friend of the family to hold it till his eldest son, then about twenty years of age, could be collated to it. As this, however, was not carried into execution, it is probable, that both the Bishop's and his own death came on more hastily than had been expected. After a life thus spent in honourable and useful pursuits, this learned and devout divine died on the 17th of August, 1723, it may be truly said, of old age, though he was then only in his 55th year. His body was buried in the Church-

yard of Headbourn-Worthy; but, as he frequently expressed a dislike to monuments, and pompous inscriptions, nothing was erected to his memory, except a plain tomb over his grave; and on the slab, which covers it, his name and age and the year of his death were mentioned. A devout and scrupulous adherence to the well-known wishes of his departed parent prevented his eldest son, who afterwards became rector of Havant, from putting up a monument to his father's memory, as he had at one time intended, with the following inscription:

Obstupesce Viator!
Venerandi hic conduntur Cineres
Josephi Bingham, A.M.
Nati Wakefeldiæ apud Eboracenses,
Collegii Universitatis apud Oxonienses quondam Socii:
Cujus multiplicem si spectes Doctrinam,
Quam Scriptis prodidit,
Si exactam veteris Disciplinæ et
Consuetudinum Ecclesiasticarum notitiam,
Cyprianica Ætate vel etiam Ignatiana,
Moribus quoque primævis
Vixisse agnoscas,
Nisi quod non esset Episcopus.
At, væ Seculo Meritorum immemori et ingrato!
Cum, qui Patriarchatum in Ecclesia meruit,
Nonnisi Headbourn-Worthy et Havanti in Agro Hanton:
Parochus, obiit
Decimo Septimo die Aug.
Anno { Christi 1723.
Ætatis 55.

This was written and sent with a letter of condolence to the family of the deceased by the same Mr. Edward Clarke, who had been his first in-

structor at the school in Wakefield, and who, through his whole life, maintained an intimate friendship with him, and continued to cultivate the highest regard for his memory.

At the time of my learned ancestor's decease only six of his ten children, two sons and four daughters, were living, who, with their widowed mother, were left in very contracted circumstances. Mrs. Bingham was therefore induced to sell the copy-right of her late husband's writings to the booksellers, who immediately published the whole of his works, which had appeared in print, in two volumes folio, without making any alterations; and though the eldest son of the deceased undertook the office of correcting the press, he did not insert any of the manuscript additions or notes, which had been prepared. As he was then not quite twenty years of age, he probably had not had an opportunity of examining his father's books and papers sufficiently to discover, that any such preparations for a new edition existed. Mr. Richard Bingham, the person on whom this task devolved, had been bred on the foundation at Winchester-College; and from thence, by the nomination of the same Dr. Potter, of whom we have already spoken, and who was at that time Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ-Church, he was appointed a student of that society. It having happened, as I have before stated, that the Bishop of Winchester and Mr. Joseph Bingham died on

the same day, the right of presentation to the living of Havant, therefore, lapsed to the Crown; and from thence, by the interest of friends, who properly estimated the merits of the deceased, it was obtained for a Mr. Baddeley, till the eldest son of the writer, they so much valued, should be of sufficient age to take it himself. Accordingly when Mr. Richard Bingham was in priest's orders he was collated to it by Bishop Willis, and acquitted himself in that situation, during an incumbency of thirty-seven years, as a man endowed with a strong and excellent understanding, and of the most exemplary honour, integrity, and virtue.

The widow died, in 1755, at a very advanced age, in Bishop Warner's College for clergymen's widows at Bromley, in Kent. Of the four daughters, one married a gentleman of Hampshire, of the name of Mant, the grandfather of the present Bishop of Killaloe, and the other three died single. The second son of this eminent writer, who, after his father, bore the name of Joseph, was the last of the family, and consequently extremely young at the time of his father's death. Though he died in very early life, yet during the short period of his existence, he pursued his studies with such unremitting perseverance, and gave such early proofs of genius and sound understanding, and so strongly evinced his determination to tread in the footsteps of his father, as fully entitle him to hang, as it were, on the arm of his learned

parent, and thus obtain a few lines from the pen of the biographer. This young man received his education on the foundation at the Charter-House. From whence he was, at the usual age, removed to Corpus Christi College, in Oxford. In the University he was a most exemplary and persevering student, and was preparing to give public proofs of his diligence, having actually printed every part, except the title page and preface, of the Theban Story.* Whilst he was thus usefully employed, and just as he was on the point of being ordained, with every prospect of promotion from the patronage of his father's former pupil, Archbishop Potter, he was suddenly brought to his grave, at the immature age of twenty-two, through an illness wholly occasioned by too sedentary a life, and too close an application to his studies. His body lies buried in the cloisters of Corpus Christi College, without either monument, inscription, or stone erected to his memory, though it might be most truly said of him, that he fell a martyr to application, industry, and learning. There is one further circumstance, which, as it is highly honourable to the learned person, the memoirs of whose life I have undertaken to write, it will not be deemed irrelevant to mention.

* This was completed and published after his death by a gentleman, into whose hands his papers had fallen, as a security for a sum of money, which had been borrowed to facilitate the publication.

Of such importance have the works of this eminent writer been esteemed in foreign countries, that they have all with the utmost correctness been translated into Latin by a divine of a German University. Such an undertaking the Author himself strongly recommended to any person of industry and ability, as a work, which would, he conceived, be highly useful to the Protestant Churches on the Continent; but this flattering mark of approbation he did not live to receive; for he died, as has been before stated, in 1723, and I find the first volume of his ORIGINES was published in Latin by Johannes Henricus Grischonius, at Halle, in 1724. Here I hope I may be allowed to observe, how frequently it occurs, and how encouraging it is to reflect, that the merits of an eminent ancestor are productive of honour or emolument to their posterity. It cannot be doubted, that the high literary attainments of my great-grandfather were the means of procuring the living of Havant for his eldest son; and a late learned and excellent Bishop of London, Dr. Robert Lowth, expressly assigned that reason for bestowing a comfortable living on his grandson; "I venerate," says he, in a letter, which conveyed the presentation of a living to my father, the Rev. I. M. Bingham, "I venerate the memory of your excellent "grandfather, my father's particular and most in-"timate friend. He was not rewarded, as he "ought to have been; I therefore give you this

" living, as a small recompense for his great and
" inestimable merits."

I cannot, perhaps, better conclude this account, than by endeavouring to give in few words the general character of this worthy divine.

His constitution, as we have before had occasion to remark, was extremely weak and sickly: yet, that his industry was unbounded and his application most indefatigable, his published works alone are abundantly sufficient to testify, without any mention being made of the immensely voluminous manuscript papers, which he left behind him at his death. These principally consisted of exhortations and discourses, which he had preached to his parishioners. For, eagerly and even zealously as he pursued his studies, he never suffered his love for them to interrupt or make him negligent in the performance of his parochial duties. His disposition was of the mildest and purest cast; nor was it ever ruffled by the common accidents or occurrences of life. So wholly indeed was he absorbed in the pursuit of knowledge, that he appears to have been above being disturbed by any concerns of a worldly nature. I have before observed, and it may here be repeated, as the strongest proof, that this is not merely the *gratis* assertion of an over partial biographer, that, when he lost at one blow the whole hard-earned profits of a laborious life, it never even for a moment so deeply affected him, as to interrupt the progress of his studies.

All arrangements, any ways relating to domestic or pecuniary matters, were left wholly in the hands of his wife and friends. Scarcely ever indeed did he for a single hour relax from his literary labours, except to fulfil those duties, which his situation, as a parochial pastor, called on him to perform.

As a husband and father he was of a kind and affectionate deportment. The duties of his profession he punctually discharged, not only with great ability, but with devout and fervent zeal, directed by pious and conscientious rectitude. As a writer his learning was deep and extensive; his style zealous, strong, energetic, and convincing; and his application in no common degree persevering and unwearied. Yet to a temper mild, humane, charitable, and benevolent, on all common and indifferent occasions, he united a zeal and fervour, in the cause of learning and of truth, which no names or authorities, however great, could awe him to relinquish; no infirmity of body or constitution could deter him from pursuing; and which no obstacle, disappointment, or opposition could diminish or impede. Though his passions were so wholly subject to the guidance of religion, and of virtue, that no worldly losses were sufficient to ruffle or disturb him; yet, whenever he believed the important interests of Christianity, or the true faith in any of its essential doctrines to be in danger, he was always ready and even eager to step forth in their defence. So free, unshackled, and

disinterested was his mind, that, according to his own words, " Though he loved not to enter into " dispute with any man, yet he did not think " great names so venerable, as to be of sufficient " authority to lead others by their dictates only, " especially in matters of faith and history, unless " they assign just grounds for their assertions."

RICHARD BINGHAM.

*** It may perhaps be observed, that much of the language, used in the preceding account, is the same as is to be found in the Life of the Author, published some few years since in the Biographical Dictionary. Though one of the *Editors* of that work has only acknowledged, the assistance I gave him by furnishing that article, in a note, saying, " From *materials* communicated by the Rev. Richard Bingham, &c. &c." The fact is, I wrote, at his request, the whole of the article, together with much other matter, which he thought fit to omit, and I have, at this moment, the manuscript, which I lent him for the purpose of its being inserted in his work. I have, therefore, freely used my own language and expressions, which I could not very easily avoid.

THE

AUTHOR'S DEDICATION.

TO THE

RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD,

JONATHAN,

LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

And Prelate of the Most Noble Order of the Garter.

MY LORD,

HAVING once determined with myself to make these collections public, I needed no long time to consider, to whom I should first address and present them. They are, my Lord, the first-fruits of my labour under your Lordship's government and inspection: and I was willing to think, and do presume I did not think amiss, that your Lordship had a sort of title to the first-fruits of any of your clergy's labour; especially if the subject, on which they were employed, was suitable to their calling, and had any direct tendency to promote Christian knowledge in the world. The subject of the present discourse, being an essay upon the ancient usages

and customs of the primitive Church, and a particular account of the state of her clergy, is such, as being considered barely in its own nature, I know cannot but be approved by a person of your Lordship's character; whose care is concerned not only in preserving the purity of the primitive faith, but also in reviving the spirit of the ancient discipline and primitive practice; and were the management any ways answerable to the greatness of the subject, that would doubly recommend it to your Lordships favour; since apples of gold, are something the more beautiful for being set in pictures of silver. But I am sensible the subject is too sublime and copious, too nice and difficult, to have justice done it from any single hand, much less from mine; all therefore I can pretend to hope for from your Lordship, is, that your candour and goodness will make just allowances for the failings, which your sagacity and quickness will easily perceive to be in this performance. I am not, I confess, without hopes, that as well the abstruseness and difficulty of the subject itself, as my own difficult circumstances, under which I was forced to labour, for want of proper assistance of abundance of books, may be some apology for the defects of the work; and if I can but so far obtain your Lordship's good opinion, as to be thought to have designed well; as I am already conscious of my own good intentions to consecrate all my labours to the public service of the Church; that will inspire me with fresh vigour, notwithstanding these difficulties, to proceed with cheerfulness and alacrity in the remaining parts of this work, which

are yet behind, and which I shall be the more willing to set about, if I can perceive that it has your Lordship's approbation. The countenance and encouragement of such a judge may perhaps have a more universal influence, to excite the zeal of many others, who have greater abilities to serve the Church; and I know not how better to congratulate your Lordship upon your happy accession to the episcopal throne of this diocese, than by wishing you the blessing and satisfaction of such a clergy, whose learning and industry, and piety and religion, influenced by the wisdom of your conduct, and animated by the example of your zeal and perseverance, even to imprisonment in times of greatest difficulty, may so qualify them to discharge every office of their function, as may make your diocese one of the shining glories of the present church, and a provoking example to the future; which is the hearty prayer and desire of,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful

and obedient servant,

J. BINGHAM.

THE

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

TO THE

FIRST VOLUME,

AS ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED.

THIS volume, which is now published, being only a part of a larger work, the reader, I presume, will expect I should give him some little account of the whole design, and the reasons, which engaged me upon this undertaking. The design, which I have formed to myself, is to give such a methodical account of the Antiquities of the Christian Church, as others have done of the Greek, and Roman, and Jewish Antiquities; not by writing an historical, or continued chronological account of all transactions as they happened in the Church, of which kind of books there is no great want, but by reducing the ancient customs, usages, and practices of the Church under certain proper heads, whereby the reader may take a view at once of any particular usage or custom of Christians, for four or five of the first centuries, to which I have generally confined my inquiries in this discourse. I cannot but own, I was moved with a sort of emulation, not an unholy one, I hope, to see so many learned men with so much zeal, employed in collecting and publishing the Antiquities of Greece and Rome; whilst in the meantime we had nothing, so far as I was able to learn, that could be called a complete collection of the Antiquities of the Church, in the method that is now proposed. The compilers of Church-history, indeed, have

taken notice of many things of this kind, as they pass along in the course of their history, as Baronius, and the Centuriators, and several others: but then the things lie scattered in so many places, in large volumes, that there are few readers of those few that enter upon reading those books, that will be at the pains to collect their accounts of things into one view, or digest and methodize their scattered observations. There are a great many other authors, who have written several excellent discourses upon particular subjects of Church-antiquity, out of which, perhaps, a Gronovius or a Grœvius might make a more noble collection of antiquities, than any yet extant in the world: but, as no one has yet attempted such a work, so neither, when it was affected, would it be for the purchase or perusal of every ordinary reader, for whose use chiefly my own collections are intended. There are a third sort of writers, who have also done very good service in explaining and illustrating several parts of Church Antiquity, in their occasional notes and observations upon many of the ancient writers; of which kind are the curious observations of Albaspiny, Justellus, Petavius, Valesius, Cotelerius, Baluzius, Sirmondus, Gothofred, Fabrotus, Bishop Beverege, and many others, who have published the works of the ancient Fathers, and canons of the councils, with very excellent and judicious remarks upon them. But these again lie scattered in so many and so large volumes, without any other order, than as the authors on whom they commented would admit of, that they are not to be reckoned upon, or used, as any methodized or digested collection of Church Antiquities, even by those, who have ability to purchase, or opportunity to read them. Besides these there are another sort of writers, who have purposely undertaken to give an account of the ancient usages of the Church, in treatises written particularly upon that subject; such as Gavantus, Casalius, Durantus, and several others of the Roman Communion: but these writers do by no means

satisfy a judicious aud inquisitive reader, for several reasons. 1. Because their accounts are very imperfect, being confined chiefly to the liturgical part of Church Antiquity, beside which there are a great many other things necessary to be explained, which they do not so much as touch upon, or once mention. 2. Because in treating of that part they build much upon the collections of Gratian, and such modern writers, and use the authority of the spurious epistles of the ancient Popes, which have been exploded long ago, as having no pretence to antiquity in the judgment of all candid and judicious writers. But chiefly their accounts are unsatisfactory, because, 3. Their whole design is to varnish over the novel practices of the Romish Church, and put a face of antiquity upon them. To which purpose they many times represent ancient customs in disguise, to make them look like the practices of the present age, and offer them to the reader's view, not in their own native dress, but in the similitude and resemblance of modern customs. Cardinal Bona himself could not forbear making this reflection upon some such writers as these, whom he justly censures, as deserving very ill of the sacred rites of the Church,* and their venerable antiquity; who measure all ancient customs by the practice of the present times, and judge of the primitive discipline only by the rule and customs of the age they live in; being deceived by a false persuasion, that the practice of the Church never differed in any point from the customs, which they learned from their forefathers and teachers, and which they have been inured to from their tender years; whereas we retain many words in common with the ancient fathers, but in a sense as different from theirs, as our times are remote from the first ages after Christ; as will appear, says he, when we come to discourse

* Bona Rerum Liturgic. lib. i. c. 18. n. 1.

of the oblation, communion, and other parts of divine service. This is an ingenuous confession, and withal a just reflection upon the partiality of the writers of his own Church; and a good reason, in my opinion, why we are not to expect any exact accounts of antiquity from any writers of that communion; though some are less tainted with her errors than others, and can allow themselves to be a little more liberal and free upon some occasions than the rest of their brethren. Yet even Bona himself, after the reflection he has made upon others, runs into the very same error, and falls under his own censure. And Habertus, though otherwise a very learned and ingenuous person, who has written about the Greek liturgics, as Bona has of the Latin, is often through prejudice carried away with the common failing of the writers of that side, whose talents are chiefly employed in palliating the faults of the Communion and cause they are engaged in. So that, if we are to expect any exact account of Church Antiquities, it must be from some Protestant authors, who can write with greater freedom and less prejudice concerning the usages and customs of the primitive Church. But among these there are very few that have travelled far in this way; the generality of our writers contenting themselves to collect and explain so much of Church Antiquity, as was necessary to show the errors and novelties of popery; but not descending to any more minute and particular consideration of things, which did not come within the compass of the controversy they had with the Romish Church. Hospinian, indeed, in the beginning of the reformation, wrote several large volumes of the origin of temples, festivals, Monachism, with the history of the Eucharist: but as these take in but a very few subjects, so they are too full of modern relations: which make them something tedious to an ordinary reader, and no complete account of primitive customs neither. Spalatensis, in his books *de Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ*, has gone a little further;

yet he generally confines himself to the popish controvers and has much out of Gratian and the Canon Law; which, i deed, served him as good argument *ad hominem* again those whom he had to deal with, but it will not pass for a thentic history in other cases. Suicerus's *Thesaurus E clesiasticus* is abundantly more particular, and indeed t best treasure of this sort of learning, that has yet been pul lished: but his collections are chiefly out of the Gree Fathers; and only in the method of a vocabulary or lexico explaining words and things precisely in the order of t alphabet. The most methodical account of things of th kind, that I have yet seen, is that of our learned countryma Dr. Cave, in his excellent book of Primitive Christianity wherein he has given a succinct, but clear account of ma ancient customs and practices, not ordinarily to be met wi elsewhere. But his design being chiefly to recommend t moral part of primitive Christianity to the observation a practice of men, he was not obliged to be very particular i explaining many other things, which, though useful in the selves, yet might be looked upon as foreign to his desig and for that reason, I presume, he industriously omitt them. There are some other books, which I have not y seen, but only guess by the titles that they may be of th kind; such as Bebelius's *Antiquitates Ecclesiasticæ, Ma tinay de Ritibus Ecclesiæ, Hendecius de Antiquitatibus E clesiasticis, Quenstedt Antiquitates Biblicæ et Ecclesiastic* But I presume, whatever they are, they will not forestal m design, which is chiefly to gratify the English reader wi an entire collection of Church Antiquities in our own la guage, of which this volume is published as a specime and, if this proves useful to the public, and finds a favourab acceptance, it will be followed with the remaining parts the work, as my time and ocassions will give me leave, a cording to the scheme here laid down, or with as little v riation as may be. I shall next treat of the inferior orde

of the clergy, as I have here done of the superior: then of the elections and ordinations of the clergy, and the several qualifications of those, that were to be ordained: of the privileges, immunities, and revenues of the clergy, and the several laws and rules, which particularly respected their function. To which I shall subjoin an account of the ancient ascetics, monks, virgins, and widows, who were a sort of retainers to the Church. After this shall follow an account of the ancient Churches, and their several parts, utensils, consecrations, immunities, together with a *Notitia* of the ancient division of the Church into provinces, dioceses, parishes, and the original of these. After which I shall speak of the service of the Church, beginning with the institution and instruction of the catechumens, and describing their several stages before baptism: then speak of baptism itself, and its ordinary concomitant, confirmation. Then proceed to the other solemn services of psalmody, reading of the Scripture, and preaching, which were the first part of the ancient Church service; then speak of their prayers and the several rites and customs observed therein; where of the use of liturgies and the Lord's prayer; and of the prayers of catechumens, energumens, and penitents; all which part of the service thus far was commonly called by the name of the *Missa Catechumenorum;* then of the *Missa Fidelium,* or communion-service; where of the manner of their oblations, and celebration of the Eucharist, which was always the close of the ordinary Church service. After this I shall proceed to give a particular account of their fasts and festivals, their marriage rites and funeral rites, and the exercise of ancient Church discipline; their manner of holding councils and synods, provincial, patriarchal, œcumenical; the power of Christian princes in councils, and out of them; The manner and use of their *Literæ Formatæ,* and the several sorts of them: their different ways of computation of time; to which I shall add an

account of their schools, libraries, and methods of educating and training up persons for the ministry, and say something of the several translations of the Bible in use among them, and several other miscellaneous rites and things, which would properly come under none of the forementioned heads; such as their manner of taking oaths, their abstinence from blood, their frequent use of the sign of the cross, their several sorts of public charities, the honours which they paid to their martyrs, together with an account of their sufferings, and the several instruments of cruelty used by the heathen to harass and torment them. In treating of all which, or any other such like matters, as shall offer themselves, I shall observe the same method, that I have done in this volume; illustrating the ancient customs from the original records of antiquity, and joining the opinions of the best modern authors, that I can have opportunity to peruse, for unfolding points of greatest difficulty. I confess, indeed, this work will suffer something in my hands, for want of several books, which I have no opportunity to see, nor ability to purchase; but that perhaps may tempt some others, who are at the fountains of learning, and have all manner of books at command, to add to my labours, and improve this essay to a much greater perfection; since it is a subject that will never be exhausted, but still be capable of additions and improvement. The chief assistance I have hitherto had, is from the noble benefaction of one, who being dead, yet speaketh. I mean the renowned bishop Morely, whose memory will for ever remain fresh in the hearts of the learned and the good; who, among many other eminent works of charity and generosity, becoming his great soul, and high station in the Church, such as the augmentation of several small benefices, and provision of a decent habitation and maintenance for the widows of poor clergymen in his diocese, &c. has also bequeathed a very valuable collection of books to the Church of Winchester,

for the advancement of learning among the parochial clergy; and I reckon it none of the least part of my happiness, that Providence removing me early from the university, where the best supplies of learning are to be had, placed me by the hands of a generous benefactor,* without any importunity or seeking of my own, in such a station, as gives me liberty and opportunity to make use of so good a library, though not so perfect as I could wish. But the very mentioning this, as it is but a just debt to the memory of that great prelate, so perhaps it may provoke some other generous spirit, of like abilities and fortune with him, to add new supplies of modern books published since his death, to augment and complete his benefaction. Which would be an addition of new succours and auxiliaries to myself, and others in my circumstances, and better enable us to serve the public. In the mean time, the reader may with ease enjoy, what with no small pains and industry I have collected and put together; and he may make additions from his own reading and observation, as I have done upon several authors, whom I have had occasion to peruse and mention. From some of which, and those of great fame and learning, I have sometimes thought myself obliged to dissent, upon some nice and peculiar questions; but I have never done it without giving my reasons, and treating them with that decency and respect, which is due to their great learning and character. If in any thing I have made mistakes of my own, as I cannot be so vain as to think I have made none, every intelligent reader may make himself judge, and correct them with ingenuity and candour. All I can say is, That I have been as careful to avoid mistakes as I could in so critical and curious a subject; and I hope there will not be found so many, but that this essay may

* Dr. Radcliffe.

prove useful both to the learned and unlearned; to instruct the one, who cannot read these things in their originals; and refresh the memories of the other, who may know many things, that they cannot always readily have recourse to. Or, if it be of no use to greater proficients, it may at least be some help to young students and new beginners, and both provoke them to the study of ancient learning, and a little prepare them for their entrance upon it. Besides, I considered, there were some, who might have a good inclination toward the study of these things, who yet have neither ability to purchase, nor time and opportunity to read over many ancient fathers and councils; and to such, a work of this nature, composed ready to their hands, might be of considerable use, to acquaint them with the state and practice of the primitive Church, when they have no better opportunities to be informed about it. If, in any of these respects, these collections, which were designed for the honour of the ancient Church, and the benefit of the present, may prove serviceable toward those ends, I shall not think my time and pains ill bestowed.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

OF THE SEVERAL NAMES AND ORDERS OF MEN IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the several Titles and Appellations of Christians, which they owned, and distinguished themselves by.

Sect. 1. Christians at first called Jesseans, and *Therapeutæ*, Πιστοὶ, ἐκλεκτοὶ, &c.—2. Of the technical names, ΙΧΘΥΣ and *Pisciculi*.—3. Christians, why called *Gnostici*.—4. Sometimes called *Theophori* and *Christophori*. 5. Sometimes, but very rarely, *Christi*.—6. Christians great enemies to all party names and human appellations.—7. Of the name Catholic, and its antiquity.—8. In what sense the name, Ecclesiastics, was given to all Christians.—9. The Christian religion called Δόγμα, and Christians, οἱ τοῦ Δόγματος.—10. Christians called Jews by the Heathens.—11. Christ, by the Heathens commonly called Chrestus, and Christians, Chrestians.

CHAP. II.

Of the Names of Reproach which the Jews, Infidels, and Heretics cast upon the Christians.

Sect. 1. Christians called Nazarens by the Jews and Heathens.—2. And Galilæans.—3. Also Atheists.—4. And Greeks and impostors.—5. Magicians.—6. The new Superstition.—7. Christians, why called Sibyllists.—8. Biathanati.—9. Parabolarii, and Desperati.—10. Sarmentitii, and Semaxii.—11. Lucifugax Natio.—12. Plautina Prosapia, and Pistores.—13. With what Names the Heretics reproached the Orthodox Christians.—14. Christians called Psychici, by the Montanists.—15. Allegorists, by the Millenaries.—16. Chronitæ, by the Aetians; Simplices, by the Manichees; Anthropolatræ, by the Apollinarians.—17. Philosarcæ and Pelusiotæ, &c. by the Origenians.—18. The Synagogue of Antichrist and Satan, by the Luciferians.

CHAP. III.

Of the several Orders of Men in the Christian Church.

Sect. 1.—Three Sorts of Members of the Christian Church, the Ἡγούμενοι, Πιστοὶ, Κατηχούμενοι.—2. Believers here strictly taken for the Laity that were Baptized.—3. Catechumens owned as imperfect Members of the Church.—4. Heretics not reckoned among Christians.—5. Penitents and Energumens ranked in the same Class with Catechumens.

CHAP. IV.

A more particular Account of the Πιστοὶ, *or Believers; their Titles of Honour and Privileges above the Catechumens.*

Sect. 1. Believers otherwise called Φωτιζόμενοι, the *Illuminate*.—2. And οἱ μεμυημένοι, *the Initiated*.—3. And Τέλειοι, *the Perfect*.—4. Chari Dei, Filii Dei, Ἅγιοι, &c.—5. The Privileges of the *Fideles*. 1. To partake of the Eucharist.—6. 2. To join in all the Prayers of the Church.—7. 3. The Use of the Lord's Prayer, another Prerogative of the Πιστοὶ; whence it was called Εὐχὴ πιστῶν, *The Prayer of Believers*.—8. 4. They were admitted to hear Discourses upon the most profound Mysteries of Religion.

CHAP. V.

Of the Distinction betwixt the Laity and Clergy, and of the Antiquity of that Distinction.

Sect. 1. The *Fideles*, otherwise called *Laici*, to distinguish them from the Clergy.—2. The Antiquity of this Distinction proved against Rigaltius, Salmasius, and Selden.—3. An Objection from 1 Pet. v. 3. answered.—4. A Distinction in the Offices of Laity and Clergy always observed.—5. Laymen also called Βιωτικοὶ, *Seculare*.—6. And Ἰδιῶται, *Private Men*.—7. What Persons properly called *Clerici*.—8. The name *Clerici* sometimes appropriate to the Inferior Orders.—9. The Reason of the Name *Clerici*.—10. All the Clergy called *Canonici*.—11. And Τάξις τῶ Βήματος, *the Order of the Sanctuary*.

BOOK II.

OF THE SEVERAL ORDERS OF THE CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the Original of Bishops; and that they were a distinct Order from Presbyters in the Primitive Church.

Sect. 1. What the Ancients mean by different Orders of Bishops and Presbyters.—2. The Order of Bishops always owned to be superior to that of Presbyters.—3. The Order of Bishops, of Apostolical Institution.—4. A List or Catalogue of such Bishops as were first ordained by the Apostles.

CHAP. II.

Of the several Titles of Honour given to Bishops in the Primitive Church.

Sect. 1. All Bishops at first called Apostles.—2. After that, Successors of the Apostles.—3. Whence every Bishop's See, called *Sedes Apostolica*.—4. Bishops called Princes of the People.—5. *Præpositi*, Προεστῶτες, Πρόεδροι, Ἔφοροι.—6. *Principes Sacerdotum*, *Pontifices Maximi*, *Summi Sacerdotes*, &c.—7. Every Bishop anciently called *Papa*, *Father*, or *Pope*.—8. *Pater Patrum*, and *Episcopus Episcoporum*.—9. Bishops sometimes called Patriarchs.—10. And Vicars of Christ.—11. And Angels of the Churches.

CHAP. III.

Of the Offices of Bishops as distinct from Presbyters.

SECT. 1. A threefold Difference between Bishops and Presbyters in the Discharge of their Office and Functions.—2. 1. In the common Offices which might be performed by both; the Bishop acted by an Independent Power; but Presbyters in Dependence upon, and Subordination to him.—3. This specified in the Offices of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper.—4. And in the Office of Preaching.—5. 2. The Office and Power of Ordination never entrusted in the Hands of Presbyters.—6. Ordinations by Presbyters disannulled by the Church.—7. Some Allegations to the contrary examined.—8. 3. A Third Difference between Bishops and Presbyters;—Presbyters accountable to their Bishops, not Bishops to their Presbyters.—9. Yet Bishops' Power not arbitrary, but limited by Canon in various Respects.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Power of Bishops over the Laity, Monks, subordinate Magistrates, and all Persons within their Diocese; and of their Office in disposing of the Revenues of the Church.

SECT. 1. No Exemptions from the Jurisdiction of the Bishop in the Primitive Church.—2. All Monks subject to the Bishop of the Diocese, where they lived.—3. As also all subordinate Magistrates in Matters of Spiritual Jurisdiction.—4. Of the Distinction between Temporal and Spiritual Jurisdiction; Bishops' Power wholly confined to the latter.—5. An Account of the *Literæ Formatæ*, and the Bishop's Prerogative in granting them to all Persons.—6. Of the Bishop's Power in disposing of the Revenues of the Church.

CHAP. V.

Of the Office of Bishops, in Relation to the whole Catholic Church.

SECT. 1. In what sense every Bishop supposed to be Bishop of the whole Catholic Church.—2. In what Respect the whole World but one Diocese, and but one Bishopric in the Church.—3. Some particular Instances of Private Bishops acting as Bishops of the whole Universal Church.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Independency of Bishops, especially in the Cyprianic Age, and in the African Churches.

SECT. 1. What meant by the Independency of Bishops one of another, and their absolute Power in their own Church.—2. All Bishops had Liberty to form their own Liturgies.—3. And express the same Creed in different Forms.—4. And appoint particular Days of Fasting in their own Churches.—5. The Independency of Bishops most conspicuous in the African Churches.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Power of Bishops in Hearing and Determining Secular Causes.

SECT. 1. Bishops commonly chosen Arbitrators of Men's Differences in the Primitive Church.—2. The Original of this Custom. What meant by the Word ἐξουθενημένοι in St. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 4.—3. This Power of Bishops confirmed by the Imperial Laws.—4. Yet not allowed in Criminal Causes; nor in any Causes, but when the Litigants both agreed to take them for Arbitrators.—5. Bishops sometimes made their Presbyters, and sometimes Laymen, their Substitutes in this Affair.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Privilege of Bishops to intercede for Criminals.

SECT. 1. Of the great Power and Interest of Bishops in Interceding to the Secular Magistrates.—2. The Reasons why Bishops interceded for some Criminals and not others.—3. They never interceded in Civil Matters and Pecuniary Causes.

CHAP. IX.

Of some particular Honours and Instances of Respect showed to Bishops by all Persons in general.

SECT. 1. Of the ancient Custom of bowing the Head, to receive the Benediction of Bishops.—2. Of kissing their Hand.—3. The Custom of singing Hosannas to them sometimes used, but not approved.—4. What meant by the *Corona Sacerdotalis*, and the Form of saluting Bishops *Per Coronam*.—5. Whether Bishops anciently wore a Mitre, or any the like Ornament.—6. Of the Titles Ἁγιώτατοι, *Sanctissimi, &c.*—7. Bishops distinguished by their Throne in the Church.

CHAP. X.

Of the Age, and some particular Qualifications required in such as were to be Ordained Bishops.

SECT. 1. Bishops not to be Ordained under Thirty Years of Age, except they were Men of extraordinary Worth.—2. Bishops to be chosen out of the Clergy of the Church to which they were Ordained.—3. Some Exceptions to this Rule.—4. Bishops to go through the Inferior Orders of the Church.—5. Deacons might be ordained Bishops, though never ordained Presbyters.—6. Bishops in Cases of Necessity chosen out of the Inferior Orders.—7. And in some extraordinary Cases ordained immediately from Laymen.

CHAP. XI.

Of some particular Laws and Customs observed about the Ordination of Bishops.

SECT. 1. Bishoprics not to be void above three Months.—2. In some Places a new Bishop was chosen before the old one was buried.—3. Some Instances of longer Vacancies in Times of Difficulty and Persecution.—4.

Three Bishops required to the Ordination of a Bishop.—5. Yet Ordinations by one Bishop allowed to be valid, though not canonical.—6. The Bishop of Rome not privileged to Ordain alone, any more than any other single Bishop.—7. Every Bishop to be ordained in his own Church.—8. The ancient Form of Ordination of Bishops.—9. A Form of Prayer used at their Consecration.—10. Of their Enthronement, *Homiliæ Enthronisticæ* and *Litræ Enthronisticæ*.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Rule which prohibits Bishops to be ordained in small Cities.

SECT. 1. The Reason of the Law against placing Bishops in small Cities.—2. Some Exceptions to this Rule in Egypt, Libya, Cyprus, Arabia, Asia Minor, &c.—3. Reasons for erecting Bishoprics in small Cities.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Rule which forbids Two Bishops to be ordained in one City.

SECT. 1. The general Rule and Practice of the Church, to have but one Bishop in a City.—2. Yet Two Bishops sometimes allowed by Compromise, to end a Dispute, or cure an inveterate Schism.—3. The Opinions of Learned Men concerning two Bishops in a City in the Apostolical Age, one of the Jews, and the other of the Gentiles.—4. The Case of Coadjutors.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the Chorepiscopi, Περιοδευταὶ, *and Suffragan Bishops; and how these differed from one another.*

SECT. 1. Of the Reason of the Name *Chorepiscopi*, and the Mistake of some about it.—2. Three different Opinions about the Nature of this Order: 1st. That they were mere Presbyters.—3. A second Opinion, that some of them were Presbyters, and some of them Bishops.—4. The third Opinion, that they were all Bishops, the most probable.—5. Some Objections against this answered.—6. The *Chorepiscopi* allowed to ordain the inferior Clergy, but not Presbyters or Deacons, without special License from the City-Bishop.—7. They had Power to confirm.—8. And Power to grant Letters Dimissory to the Clergy.—9. They had Power to officiate in the Presence of the City-Bishop.—10. And to sit and vote in Council.—11. The Power of the *Chorepiscopi* not the same in all Times and Places.—12. Their Power first struck at by the Council of Laodicea, which set up Περιοδευταὶ in their Room.—13. Of the Attempt to restore the *Chorepiscopi* in England, under the Name of Suffragan Bishops.—14. Suffragan Bishops different from the *Chorepiscopi* in the Primitive Church.—15. The Suffragan Bishops of the Roman Provinces called by a technical Name, *Libra*.

CHAP. XV.

Of the Intercessores and Interventores in the African Churches.

SECT. 1. Why some Bishops called Intercessors in the African Churches. 2. The Office of an Intercessor not to last above a Year.—3. No Intercessor to be made Bishop of the Place where he was constituted Intercessor.

CHAP. XVI.

Of Primates or Metropolitans.

SECT. 1. Some derive the original of Metropolitans from Apostolical Constitution.—2. Others from the Age next after the Apostles.—3. Confessed by all to have been long before the Council of Nice.—4. Proofs of Metropolitans in the second Century.—5. By what Names Metropolitans were anciently called.—6. Primates in Afric called *Senes*, because the oldest Bishop was always Metropolitan.—7. How African Bishops might forfeit their Title to the Primacy.—8. A Register of Ordinations to be kept in the Primate's Church. And all Bishops to take place by Seniority, &c.—9. Three sorts of Honorary Primates, besides the Primate in Power. 1. *Primates Œco.*—10. 2. Titular Metropolitans. 11. 3. The Bishops of some Mother-Churches, which were honoured by ancient Custom.—12. The Offices of Metropolitans. 1. To ordain their Suffragan Bishops.—13. This Power continued to them after the setting up of Patriarchs.—14. Yet this Power not arbitrary, but determined by the Major Vote of a Provincial Synod.—15. Metropolitans to be chosen and ordained by their own Provincial Synod.—16. 2. The second Office of Metropolitans, to decide Controversies arising among their Provincial Bishops, and take Appeals from them.—17. 3. Their third Office, to call Provincial Synods, which all Suffragans were obliged to attend.—18. 4. Metropolitans to publish Imperial Laws and Canons, visit Dioceses, and correct Abuses.—19. 5. Bishops not to travel without the Letters of their Metropolitan.—20. 6. Metropolitans to take care of vacant Sees within their Province.—21. 7. Metropolitans to calculate the Time of Easter.—22. How the Power of Metropolitans grew in after Ages.—23. The Primate of Alexandria had the greatest Power of any other.—24. All Metropolitans called *Apostolici*, and their Sees, *Sedes Apostolicæ*.

CHAP. XVII.

Of Patriarchs.

SECT. 1. Patriarchs, anciently called Archbishops.—2. And Exarchs of the Diocese.—3. Salmasius's Mistake about the first Use of the Name Patriarch.—4. Of the Jewish Patriarchs, their first Rise, Duration, and Extinction.—5. Of the Patriarchs among the Montanists.—6. The Name Patriarch first used by Socrates, and in the Council of Chalcedon.—7. Four different Opinions concerning the first Rise of Patriarchal Power.—8. The Opinion of Spalatensis and St. Jerom preferred.—9. Patriarchal Power established in three General-Councils successively: viz. Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.—10. The Power of Patriarchs not exactly the same in all Churches. The Patriarch of Constantinople had some peculiar Privileges.—11. The Patriarch of Alexandria had also Privileges peculiar to himself.—12. The First Privilege of Patriarchs was to Ordain all the Metropolitans of the Diocese, and receive his own Ordination from a Diocesan Synod.—13. A Second Privilege, to call Diocesan Synods and preside in them.—14. A Third Privilege, to receive Appeals from Metropolitans and Provincial Synods.—15. A Fourth Privilege, to censure Metro, olitans, and also their Suffragans, when Metropolitans were remiss in censuring them.—16. A Fifth Privilege. Patriarchs might make Metropolitans their Commissioners, &c.—17. A Sixth Privilege. The Patriarch to be consulted by his Metropolitans in Matters of any great Moment.—18. A Seventh Privilege. Patriarchs to communicate to the Metropolitans such Imperial Laws as concerned the Church, &c.—19. The Eighth Privilege. Great Criminals reserved to

the Patriarch's Absolution.—20. The Ninth Privilege. The greater Patriarchs Absolute, and Independent of one another.—21. The Patriarch of Constantinople dignified with the Title of Œcumenical, and his Church Head of all Churches.—22. Of subordinate Patriarchs. What Figure they made in the Church, and that they were not mere titular Patriarchs.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of the Ἀυτοκέφαλοι.

Sect. 1. All Metropolitans anciently styled Ἀυτοκέφαλοι.—2. Some Metropolitans independent after the setting up of Patriarchal Power, as those of Cyprus, Iberia, Armenia, and the Church of Britain.—3. A Third sort of Ἀυτοκέφαλοι, such Bishops as were subject to no Metropolitan, but only to the Patriarch of the Diocese.—4. A Fourth sort of Ἀυτοκέφαλοι.

CHAP. XIX.

Of Presbyters.

Sect. 1. The meaning of the Name Presbyter.—2. Apostles and Bishops sometimes called Presbyters.—3. The Original of Presbyters properly so called.—4. The Powers and Privileges of Presbyters.—5. Presbyters allowed to sit with the Bishop on Thrones in the Church.—6. The Form of their sitting in a Semicircle; whence they were called *Corona Presbyterii*.—7. Presbyters the Ecclesiastical Senate, or Council of the Church, whom the Bishop consulted and advised with upon all Occasions.—8. Some Evidences out of Ignatius and Cyprian, of the Power and Prerogatives of Presbyters in conjunction with the Bishop.—9. The Power of Presbyters thought by some to be a little diminished in the Fourth Century.—10. Yet still they were admitted to join with the Bishop in the Imposition of Hands in the Ordination of Presbyters.—11. And allowed to sit in Consistory with their Bishops.—12. As also in Provincial Councils.—13. And in General-Councils likewise.—14. Of the Titles of Honour given to Presbyters, as well as Bishops, and what Difference there was between them, as applied to both.—15. In what sense Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, called Priests, by Optatus.—16. Why Priests called Mediators between God and Men.—17. The ancient Form and Manner of ordaining Presbyters.—18. Of the *Archipresbyteri*.—19. Of the *Seniores Ecclesiastici*. That these were not Lay-Elders in the Modern Acceptation.

CHAP. XX.

Of Deacons.

Sect. 1. Deacons always reckoned One of the Three Sacred Orders of the Church.—2. Yet not generally called Priests, but Ministers and Levites.—3. For this Reason the Bishop was not tied to have the Assistance of any Presbyters to ordain them.—4. The Deacon's Office to take Care of the Utensils of the Altar.—5. 2. To receive the Oblations of the People, and present them to the Priest, and recite the Names of those that offered.—6. 3. To read the Gospel in some Churches.—7. 4. To minister the consecrated Elements of Bread and Wine to the People in the Eucharist.—8. But not allowed to consecrate them at the Altar.—9. 5. Deacons allowed to Baptize, in some Places.—10. 6. Deacons to bid Prayer in the Congregation.—11. 7. Deacons allowed to preach by the Bishop's

Authority.—12. 8. Also to reconcile Penitents in Cases of extreme Necessity. And to suspend the Inferior Clergy in some extraordinary Cases.—13. 9. Deacons to attend upon their Bishops, and sometimes represent them in General-Councils.—14. 10. Deacons empowered to rebuke and correct Men that behaved themselves irregularly in the Church.—15. 11. Deacons anciently performed the Offices of all the Inferior Orders of the Church.—16. 12. Deacons the Bishop's Sub-Almoners.—17. 13. Deacons to inform the Bishop of the Misdemeanours of the People.—18. Hence Deacons commonly called the Bishop's Eyes, his Mouth, Angels, Prophets, &c.—19. Deacons to be multiplied according to the Necessities of the Church.—20. Of the Age at which Deacons might be ordained.—21. Of the Respect which Deacons paid to Presbyters, and received from the Inferior Orders.

CHAP. XXI.

Of Archdeacons.

SECT. 1. Archdeacons anciently of the same Order with Deacons.—2. Elected by the Bishop, and not made by Seniority.—3. Commonly Persons of such Interest in the Church, that they were chosen the Bishop's Successors.—4. The Offices of the Archdeacon. 1. To attend the Bishop at the Altar, &c.—5. 2. To assist him in managing the Church's Revenues.—6. 3. In Preaching.—7. 4. In Ordaining the Inferior Clergy.—8. 5. The Archdeacon had Power to censure Deacons and the Inferior Clergy, but not Presbyters.—9. Of the Name Ἀπαντιτής, *Circumlustrator*, and whether Archdeacons had any Power over the whole Diocese.—10. Of the Name *Cor-Episcopi*, why given to Archdeacons.—11. The Opinions of Learned Men concerning the first Original of the Name and Office of Archdeacon.

CHAP. XXII.

Of Deaconesses.

SECT. 1. The ancient Name of Deaconesses, Διάκονοι, Πρεσβύτιδες. *Viduæ*, *Ministræ*.—2. Deaconesses to be Widows by some Laws.—3. And such Widows as had Children.—4. Not to be ordained under Sixty Years of Age, by the most ancient Canons.—5. To be such as had been only the Wives of one Man.—6. Whether Deaconesses were anciently ordained by Imposition of Hands.—7. Not consecrated to any Office of the Priesthood.—8. Their Offices. 1. To assist at the Baptism of Women.—9. 2. To be a Sort of Private Catechists to the Women-Catechumens.—10. 3. To visit and attend Women that were Sick and in Distress.—11. 4. To Minister to the Martyrs and Confessors in Prison.—12. 5. To attend the Women's Gate in the Church.—13. 6. To preside over the Widows, &c.—14. How long this Order continued in the Church.—15. Another Notion of the Name *Diaconissa*, as it signifies a Deacon's Wife.

BOOK III.

OF THE INFERIOR ORDERS OF THE CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the first Original of the Inferior Orders, and the Number and Use of them: and how they differed from the Superior Orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons.

SECT. 1. The Inferior Orders not of Apostolical, but only Ecclesiastical Institution, proved against Baronius and the Council of Trent.—2. No certain Number of them in the Primitive Church.—3. Not instituted in all Churches at the same Time.—4. The principal Use of them in the Primitive Church, to be a sort of Nursery for the Hierarchy.—5. Not allowed to forsake their Service, and return to a mere Secular Life again.—6. How they differed from the Superior Orders, in Name, in Office, and in Manner of Ordination.

CHAP. II.

Of Subdeacons.

SECT. 1.—No mention of Subdeacons, till the Third Century.—2. Their Ordination performed without Imposition of Hands in the Latin Church.—3. A brief Account of their Office.—4. What Offices they might not perform.—5. The Singularity of the Church of Rome, in keeping to the precise Number of Seven Subdeacons.

CHAP. III.

Of Acolythists.

SECT. 1. Acolythists an Order peculiar to the Latin Church, and never mentioned by any Greek Writers for Four Centuries.—2. Their Ordination and Office.—3. The Origination of the Name.—4. Whether Acolythists be the same with the *Deputati* and *Ceroferarii* of later Ages.

CHAP. IV.

Of Exorcists.

SECT. 1. Exorcists at first no peculiar Order of the Clergy.—2. Bishops and Presbyters, for the Three First Centuries, the usual Exorcists of the Church.—3. In what Sense every Man his own Exorcist.—4. Exorcists constituted into an Order in the latter End of the Third Century.—5. Their Ordination and Office.—6. A short Account of the Energumens, their Names and Station in the Church.—7. The Exorcist chiefly concerned in the Care of them.—8. The Duty of Exorcists in reference to the Catechumens.

CHAP. V.

Of Lectors or Readers.

SECT. 1. The Order of Readers not instituted till the Third Century.—2. By whom the Scriptures were read in the Church before the Institution of that Order.—3. The Manner of Ordaining Readers.—4. Their Station and Office in the Church.—5. The Age at which they might be Ordained.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Ostiarii or Doorkeepers.

SECT. 1. No mention of this Order till the Third or Fourth Century.—2. The Manner of their Ordination in the Latin Church.—3. Their Office and Function.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Psalmistæ or Singers.

SECT. 1. The Singers a Distinct Order from Readers in the ancient Church.—2. Their Institution and Office.—3. Why called Ὑποβολεῖς.—4. What sort of Ordination they had.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Copiatæ or Fossarii.

SECT. 1. The *Copiatæ* or *Fossarii* reckoned among the *Clerici* of the Primitive Church.—2. First instituted in the Time of Constantine.—3. Why called *Decani* and *Collegiati*.—4. Their Office and Privileges.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Parabolani.

SECT. 1. The *Parabolani* ranked by some among the *Clerici*.—2. Their Institution and Office.—3. The Reason of the Name *Parabolani*.—4. Some Laws and Rules concerning their Behaviour.

CHAP. X.

Of the Catechists.

SECT. 1. Catechists no distinct Order of the Clergy, but chosen out of any other Order.—2. Readers sometimes made Catechists.—3. Why called Ναυτολόγοι by some Greek Writers.—4. Whether all Catechists taught publicly in the Church.—5. Of the Succession in the Catechetic School at Alexandria.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Ecclesiecdici and Defensores, or Syndics of the Church.

SECT. 1. Five Sorts of *Defensores* noted, Two whereof only belonged to the Church.—2. Of the *Defensores Pauperum*.—3. Of the *Defensores Eccle-*

sæ, their Office and Function.—4. Of their Quality:—whether they were Clergymen or Laymen.—5. The Ἔκδικοι and Ἐκκλησιέκδικοι among the Greeks the same with the Defensors of the Latin Church.—6. Chancellors and Defensors not the same in the Primitive Church.—7. Whether the Defensor's Office was the same with that of our modern Chancellors.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Œconomi.

SECT. 1. The *Œconomi* instituted in the Fourth Century. The Reasons of their Institution.—2. Always to be chosen out of the Clergy.—3. Their Office to take care of the Revenues of the Church, especially in the Vacancy of the Bishopric.—4. The Consent of the Clergy required in the Choice of them.

CHAP. XIII.

A brief Account of some other Inferior Officers in the Church.

SECT. 1. Of the Παραμονάριοι, or *Mansionarii*.—2. Of the *Custodes Ecclesiarum*, and *Custodes Locorum Sanctorum*; and how those differed from each other.—3. Of the *Sceuophylaces*, or *Ceimeliarchæ*.—4. Of the *Hermeneutæ*, or *Interpreters*.—5. Of the *Notarii*.—6. Of the *Apocrisarii*, or *Responsales*.

BOOK IV.

OF THE ELECTIONS AND ORDINATIONS OF THE CLERGY, AND THE PARTICULAR QUALIFICATIONS OF SUCH AS WERE TO BE ORDAINED.

CHAP. I.

Of the several Ways of Designing Persons to the Ministry, in the Apostolical and Primitive Ages of the Church.

SECT. 1. Four several Ways of Designing Persons for the Ministry. Of the First Way, by casting Lots.—2. The Second Way by making Choice of the First-fruits of the Gentile Converts.—3. The Third Way by particular Direction of the Holy Ghost.—4. The Fourth Way by Common Suffrage and Election.

CHAP. II.

A more particular Account of the ancient Method and Manner of Elections of the Clergy.

SECT. 1. The different Opinions of Learned Men concerning the People's Power anciently in Elections.—2. The Power of the People equal to that of the Inferior Clergy in the Election of a Bishop.—3. This Power not barely Testimonial, but Judicial and Elective.—4. Evidences of this

Power from some ancient Rules and Customs of the Church. As first, that no Bishop was to be obtruded on an Orthodox People without their Consent.—5. Secondly. This further confirmed from Examples of the Bishops' complying with the Voice of the People against their own Inclination.—6. Thirdly. From the Manner of the People's Voting at Elections.—7. Fourthly. From the Use and Office of Interventors.—8. Fifthly. From the Custom of the People's taking Persons, and having them Ordained by Force.—9. Sixthly. From the Title of Fathers, which some Bishops upon this Account by Way of Compliment gave to their People.—10. What Power the People had in the Designation of Presbyters.—11. Whether the Council of Nice made any Alteration in these Matters.—12. Some Exceptions to the General Rule. First, In Case the greatest Part of the Church were Heretics or Schismatics.—13. 2dly. In Case of Ordaining Bishops to far distant Places, or Barbarous Nations.—14. 3dly. In Case an Interventor or any other Bishop intruded himself into any See without the Consent of a Provincial Synod.—15. 4thly. In Case of Factions and Divisions among the People.—16. 5thly. The Emperors sometimes interposed their Authority to prevent Tumults in the like Cases.—17. 6thly. The People sometimes restrained to the Choice of One out of Three, which were nominated by the Bishops.—18. Lastly, By Justinian's Laws the Elections were confined to the *Optimates*, and the Inferior People wholly excluded.—19. How and when Princes and Patrons came to have the chief Power of Elections.

CHAP. III.

Of the Examination and Qualifications of Persons to be Ordained to any Office of the Clergy in the Primitive Church. And first, of their Faith and Morals.

SECT. 1. Three Inquiries made about Persons to be Ordained, respecting, 1st, Their Faith; 2dly, Their Morals; 3dly, Their outward Quality and Condition.—2. The Rule and Method of Examining their Faith and Learning.—3. The irregular Ordination of Synesius considered.—4. A strict Inquiry made into the Morals of such as were to be Ordained. 5. For which Reason no Stranger to be Ordained in a Foreign Church. 6. Nor any One who had done public Penance in the Church.—7. No Murderer to be Ordained, nor Adulterer, nor One that had lapsed in Time of Persecution.—8. No Usurer, or seditious Person.—9. Nor One who had voluntarily dismembered his own Body.—10. Men only accountable for Crimes committed after Baptism, as to what concerned Ordinations.—11. Except any great Irregularity happened in their Baptism itself. As in the Case of Clinic Baptism.—12. And Heretical Baptism. 13. No Man to be Ordained, who had not made all his Family Catholic Christians.—14. What Methods were anciently taken to prevent Simoniacal Promotions.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Qualifications of Persons to be Ordained, respecting their outward State and Condition in the World.

SECT. 1. No Soldier to be Ordained.—2. Nor any Slave or Freedman without the consent of the Patron.—3. Nor any Member of a Civil Company or Society of Tradesmen, who were tied to the Service of the Commonwealth.—4. Nor any of the *Curiales*, or *Decuriones* of the Roman Government.—5. Nor any Proctor or Guardian, till his Office expired. —6. Pleaders at Law denied Ordination in the Roman Church.—7. Also Energumens, Actors, Stage-players, &c. in all Churches.

CHAP. V.

Of the State of Digamy and Celibacy in particular; and of the Laws of the Church about these, in reference to the Ancient Clergy.

SECT. 1. No Digamist to be Ordained, by the Rule of the Apostle.—2. Three different Opinions among the Ancients about Digamy. 1. That all Persons were to be refused Orders, as Digamists, who were twice Married after Baptism.—3. 2. Others extended the Rule to all Persons twice Married, whether before or after Baptism.—4. 3. The most probable Opinion of those, who thought the Apostle by Digamists meant Polygamists, and such as married after Divorce.—5. No Vow of Celibacy required of the Clergy, as a Condition of their Ordination, for the Three first Ages.—6. The Vanity of the contrary Pretences.—7. The Clergy left to their Liberty by the Nicene Council.—8. And other Councils of that Age.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Ordinations of the Primitive Clergy, and the Laws and Customs generally observed therein.

SECT. 1. The Canons of the Church to be read to the Clerk, before the Bishops ordained him.—2. No Clerk to be Ordained ἀπολελυμένως.—3. Exceptions to this Rule very rare.—4. No Bishop to Ordain another Man's Clerk without his Consent.—5. No Bishop to Ordain in another Man's Diocese.—6. The Original of the Four Solemn Times of Ordination.—7. Ordinations indifferently given on any Day of the Week for Three Centuries.—8. The Ceremony usually performed in the Time of the Oblation at Morning-Service.—9. The Church the only regular Place of Ordination.—10. Ordination received kneeling at the Altar.—11. Given by Imposition of Hands and Prayer.—12. The Sign of the Cross used in Ordination.—13. But no Unction, nor the Ceremony of delivering Vessels into the Hands of Presbyters and Deacons.—14. Ordinations concluded with the Kiss of Peace.—15. The Anniversary Day of a Bishop's Ordination kept a Festival.

CHAP. VII.

The Case of Forced Ordinations and Re-ordinations considered.

SECT. 1. Forced Ordinations very frequent in the Primitive Church.—2. No Excuse admitted in that Case, except a Man protested upon Oath that he would not be ordained.—3. This Practice afterward prohibited by the Imperial Laws, and Canons of the Church.—4. Yet a Bishop Ordained against his Will, had not the Privilege to relinquish.—5. Re-ordinations generally condemned.—6. The Proposal made by Cæcilian to the Donatists, examined.—7. Schismatics sometimes re-ordained.—8. And Heretics also upon their Return to the Church, in some Places.

BOOK V.

OF THE PRIVILEGES, IMMUNITIES, AND REVENUES OF THE CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

Some Instances of Respect, which the Clergy paid mutually to one another.

SECT. 1. The Clergy obliged to give Entertainment to their Brethren, travelling upon necessary Occasions.—2. And to give them the Honorary Privilege of Consecrating the Eucharist in the Church.—3. The Use of the *Literæ Formatæ*, or Commendatory Letters in this Respect.—4. The Clergy obliged to end all their own Controversies among themselves.—5. What Care was taken in receiving Accusations against the Bishops and Clergy of the Church.

CHAP. I.

Instances of Respect showed to the Clergy by the Civil Government. Particularly of their Exemption from the Cognisance of the Secular Courts in Ecclesiastical Causes.

SECT. 1. Bishops not to be called into any Secular Court to give their Testimony.—2. Nor obliged to give their Testimony upon Oath, by the Laws of Justinian.—3. Whether the single Evidence of one Bishop was good in Law against the Testimony of many others.—4. Presbyters privileged against being questioned by Torture, as other Witnesses were.—5. The Clergy exempt from the ordinary Cognizance of the Secular Courts in all Ecclesiastical Causes.—6. This evidenced from the Laws of Constantius.—7. And those of Valentinian and Gratian.—8. And Theodosius the Great.—9. And Arcadius and Honorius.—10. And Valentinian the Third, and Justinian.—11. The Clergy also exempt in lesser Criminal Causes.—12. But not in greater Criminal Causes.—13. Nor in Pecuniary Causes with Laymen.—14. Of the necessary Distinction between the Supreme and Subordinate Magistrates in this Business of Exemptions.

CHAP. II.

Of the Immunities of the Clergy in reference to Taxes and Civil Offices and other burdensome Employments in the Roman Empire.

SECT. 1. No divine Right pleaded by the ancient Clergy to exempt themselves from Taxes.—2. Yet generally excused from Personal Taxes, or Head-money.—3. But not excused for their Lands and Possessions.—4. Of the Tribute called, *Aurum Tironicum*, *Equi Canonici*, &c.—5. The Church obliged to such Burthens as Lands were tied to before their Donation.—6. Of the *Chrysargyrum*, or *Lustral Tax*, and the Exemption of the Clergy from it.—7. Of the *Metatum*. What meant thereby, and the Exemption of the Clergy from it.—8. Of the *Superindicta* and *Extraordinaria*. The Clergy exempt from them.—9. The Clergy sometimes exempt from Contributing to the Reparation of Highways and Bridges.—10. As also from the Duty called *Angariæ*, and *Parangariæ*, &c.—11. Of the Tribute called, *Denarismus*, *Unciæ*, and *Descriptio Lucrativorum*;

and the Church's Exemption from it.—12. The Clergy exempt from all Civil Personal Offices.—13. And from Sordid Offices both Predial and Personal.—14. Also from Curial or Municipal Offices.—15. But this last Privilege confined to such of the Clergy, as had no Estates but what belonged to the Church, by the Laws of Constantine.—16. Constantine's Laws a little altered by the succeeding Emperors in Favour of the Church.

CHAP. III.

Of the Revenues of the Ancient Clergy.

SECT. 1. Several Ways of providing a Fund for the Maintenance of the Clergy. 1st, by Oblations. Some of which were Weekly.—2. And others Monthly.—3. Whence came the Custom of a Monthly Division among the Clergy.—4. Secondly, other Revenues arising from the Lands and Possessions of the Church.—5. These very much augmented by the Laws of Constantine.—6. Whose Laws were confirmed, and not revoked by the succeeding Emperors, as some mistake.—7. Thirdly, another Part of Church-Revenues raised by Allowances out of the Emperor's Exchequer.—8. Fourthly, the Estates of Martyrs and Confessors dying without Heirs settled upon the Church by Constantine.—9. Fifthly, the Estates of Clergymen, dying without Heirs and Will, settled in like manner.—10. Sixthly, Heathen Temples and their Revenues sometimes given to the Church.—11. Seventhly, as also Heretical Conventicles and their Revenues.—12. Eighthly, the Estates of Clerks, deserting the Church, to be forfeited to the Church.—13. No disreputable Ways of augmenting Church-Revenues encouraged. Fathers not to disinherit their Children to make the Church their Heirs.—14. Nothing to be demanded for Administering the Sacraments of the Church, nor for Consecrating Churches, nor Interment of the Dead.—15. The Oblations of the People anciently one of the most valuable Parts of Church-Revenue.

CHAP. IV.

Of Tithes and First-Fruits in particular.

SECT. 1. Tithes anciently reckoned to be due by Divine Right.—2. Why not exacted in the Apostolical Age and those that immediately followed.—3. In what Age they were first generally settled upon the Church.—4. The Original of First-fruits, and the Manner of Offering them.

CHAP. V.

Of the Management and Distribution of the Revenues of the Ancient Clergy.

SECT. 1. The Revenues of the whole Diocese anciently in the Hands of the Bishop.—2. And by his Care distributed among the Clergy.—3. Rules about the Division of Church-Revenues.—4. In some Churches the Clergy lived all in Common.—5. Alterations made in these Matters by the Endowment of Parochial Churches.—6. No Alienations to be made of Church-Revenues or Goods, but upon Extraordinary Occasions.—7. And that with the joint Consent of the Bishop and his Clergy, with the Approbation of the Metropolitan or some Provincial Bishops.

BOOK VI.

AN ACCOUNT OF SEVERAL LAWS AND RULES, RELATING TO THE EMPLOYMENT, LIFE, AND CONVERSATION OF THE PRIMITIVE CLERGY.

Of the Excellency of these Rules in general, and the Exemplariness of the Clergy in Conforming to them.

SECT. 1. The Excellency of the Christian Rules attested and envied by the Heathens.—2. The Character of the Clergy from Christian Writers.—3. Particular Exceptions no Derogation to their general good Character.—4. An Account of some ancient Writers which treat of the Duties of the Clergy.

CHAP. I.

Of Laws relating to the Life and Conversation of the Primitive Clergy.

SECT. 1. Exemplary Purity required in the Clergy above other Men. Reasons for it.—2. Church-Censures more severe against them than any others.—3. What Crimes punished with Degradation: viz. Theft, Murder, Perjury, &c.—4. Also Lapsing in Time of Persecution.—5. And Drinking and Gaming.—6. And negotiating upon Usury. The Nature of this Crime inquired into.—7. Of the Hospitality of the Clergy.—8. Of their Frugality and Contempt of the World.—9. Whether the Clergy were anciently obliged by any Law to part with their Temporal Possessions.—10. Of their great Care to be inoffensive with their Tongues.—11. Of their Care to guard against Suspicion of Evil.—Laws relating to this Matter.—12. An Account of the *Agapetæ*, and *Συνείσακτοι*, and the Laws of the Church made against them.—14. Malevolent and unavoidable Suspicions to be contemned.

CHAP. II.

Of Laws more particularly relating to the Exercise of the Duties and Offices of their Function.

SECT. 1. The Clergy obliged to lead a studious Life.—2. No Pleas allowed as just Apologies for the contrary.—3. Their chief Studies to be the Holy Scriptures, and the approved Writers and Canons of the Church.—4. How far the Study of Heathen or Heretical Books was allowed.—5. Of their Piety and Devotion in their Public Addresses to God.—6. The Censure of such as neglected the Daily Service of the Church.—7. Rules about Preaching to Edification.—8. Of Fidelity, Diligence, and Prudence, in Private Addresses and Applications.—9. Of Prudence and Candour in composing unnecessary Controversies in the Church.—10. Of their Zeal and Courage in Defending the Truth.—11. Of their Obligations to maintain the Unity of the Church; and of the Censure of such as fell into Heresy or Schism.

CHAP. III.

An Account of some other Laws and Rules, which were a sort of Out-Guards and Fences to the former.

SECT. 1. No Clergyman allowed to desert or relinquish his Station without just Grounds and Leave.—2. Yet in some Cases a Resignation was allowed of.—3. And Canonical Pensions sometimes granted in such Cases. —4. No Clergyman to remove from one Diocese to another without the Consent and Letters Dimissory of his own Bishop.—5. Laws against the Βασκανταβοι, or Wandering Clergy.—6. Laws against the Translations of Bishops from one See to another, how to be limited and understood.—7. Laws concerning the Residence of the Clergy.—8. Of Pluralities, and the Laws made about them.—9. Laws prohibiting the Clergy to take upon them Secular Business and Offices.—10. Laws prohibiting the Clergy to be Tutors and Guardians, how far extended.—11. Laws against their being Sureties, and pleading Causes at the Bar, in behalf of themselves, or their Churches.—12. Laws against their following Secular Trades and Merchandize.—13. What Limitations and Exceptions these Laws admitted of.—14. Laws respecting their outward Conversation.—15. Laws relating to their Habit.—16. The Tonsure of the Ancients very different from that of the Romish Church.—17. Of the *Corona Clericalis*, and why the Clergy called *Coronati*.—18. Whether the Clergy were distinguished in their Apparel from Laymen.—19. A particular Account of the *Birrus* and *Pallium*.—20. Of the *Collobium*, *Dalmatica*, *Caracalla*, *Hemipherium*, and *Linea*.

CHAP. IV.

Some Reflections upon the foregoing Discourse, concluding with an Address to the Clergy of the present Church.

SECT. 1. Reflection 1. All Laws and Rules of the Ancient Church not necessary to be observed by the Present Church and Clergy.—2. Reflection 2. Some ancient Rules would be of excellent use, if revived by just Authority.—3. Reflection 3. Some ancient Laws may be complied with, though not Laws of the present Church.—4. Reflection 4. Of the Influence of great Examples, and Laws of perpetual Obligation.—5. Some particular Rules recommended to Observation. 1st, Relating to the ancient Method of training up Persons for the Ministry.—6. 2dly. Their Rules for examining the Qualifications of Candidates for the Ministry.—7. 3dly. Their Rules about private Address, and the Exercise of private Discipline.—8. 4thly. Their Rules for exercising Public Discipline upon Delinquent Clergymen, who were convicted of scandalous Offences.—9. Julian's Design to reform the Heathen Priests by the Rules of the Primitive Clergy, an Argument to provoke our Zeal in the present Age.—10. The Conclusion, by way of Address to the Clergy of the present Church.

APPENDIX

TO

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR.

SOON after I had printed the foregoing particulars, relative to the life of my learned ancestor, some leaves of a Biographical Dictionary, published in 1825, by Messrs. Hunt and Clarke, of Tavistock Street, Covent Garden, fell into my hands; in which, under the head, Bingham, (Joseph), professing to give a summary account of the Life of the Author of the Antiquities of the Christian Church, I found several statements, which I am convinced are erroneous.

It is said, that Mr. Bingham "published an obnoxious sermon, containing a defence of the tenets he maintained."—Now I have every reason for knowing, that my Ancestor never maintained any tenets, which were not perfectly in accordance with the most orthodox opinions of the established Church of this Country; and further, that the sermon which I suppose is alluded to, being the one preached by him in the University Church on the subject of the Trinity, wherein he gave an Account of the opinions of the Fathers concerning

that doctrine, never was committed to the press by him, though it was highly estimated by the greatest theological students of that day, and has frequently been enquired after by eminent and learned persons. The knowledge of that fact has induced me to publish the sermon together with two others, which are on subjects somewhat similar, and with which, if I may be allowed the expression, he followed up his former discourse before many of the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester, assembled at two Episcopal Visitations. A minor error, into which the Editor, or perhaps only the printer, has fallen, is that of stating, "that Mr. Joseph Bingham was *born* in 1688," instead of, as was the fact, in 1668. He was admitted a member of the University in 1684, and took his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1688. The Editor of Messrs. Hunt and Clarke's Biographical Dictionary, when applied to by me on the subject of these erroneous statements, immediately replied, that I should find the first of these assertions, of which I complained, much more forcibly expressed under the article, Bingham, in Dr. Lempriere's Biographical Dictionary, printed for Cadell and Davis, in 1808, and from which, it seemed to be acknowledged, he had partly borrowed his account. On referring to Dr. Lempriere's book, I found indeed, to my great surprise, that it contained the error above alluded to, with the additional misstatement, that my Great Grandfather had

printed and published the two Sermons also, which he preached, shortly after leaving the University, before the Clergy, at Visitations at Winchester, and Bishop's Waltham; and Dr. Lempriere has thought fit, without it having been possible for him to have heard or read them, or even to have known any thing of their contents, to call them "offensive" sermons. Now I venture positively to assert, from the best sources of information, that they gave the highest satisfaction to their learned hearers; and that the preacher was earnestly requested to publish them, which he prepared to do, but did not carry into effect, being influenced by the best of motives; not wishing to add fuel to the ardor of controversy, which appeared to be rapidly gaining strength.—Whether Dr. Lempriere's epithet is with any propriety applied to the Sermons in question, the *Christian* reader will be able to judge for himself, since I have now published them from the original manuscript copies, as written and preached. I designedly say the *Christian* Reader, because to the Photinian, the Arian, Sabellian and Tritheist, they must necessarily be "offensive," and such they were of course designed to be; not in any personal point of view, but inasmuch as they assail each of those fatal heresies. Dr. Lempriere also states, that our author published his Antiquities in ten Vols. Octavo, *and* in two Vols. Folio:—whereas

the Folio edition was not printed until 1726, being three years after his death; and it was then published by the booksellers without any of the manuscript additions and notes, which he had prepared for a second edition, and which, as I am in possession of the original manuscripts, now appear. Dr. Lempriere commits another error, in saying that the author's *son* was presented to the living of Havant by Bishop Lowth. This statement is in many particulars incorrect. The living of Havant, which is in Hampshire, is in the gift of the Bishop of Winchester. Dr. Lowth was Bishop of London, but never so of Winchester, and he was many years *younger* than the learned author's *son*, who was indeed, (and I have in the preceding part of this Biographical Sketch so stated), as soon as he was old enough to be ordained Priest after his father's death, presented to Havant by the crown, to whom the presentation to the living, for that turn, lapsed, in consequence of Dr. Trimnell, the Bishop of Winchester, and my Great Grandfather, Joseph Bingham, having died on the same day. Dr. Robert Lowth, at a period many years subsequent to the death of our author's son, who succeeded his father as Rector of Havant, presented a living, which was in his own patronage as Bishop of London, to my father the Rev. J. M. Bingham, saying, in his letter, which covered the presentation, as I have before fully stated, " that he gave him

the living, as a small recompense for the poorly rewarded, but great and inestimable merits of his excellent Grandfather, whose memory he venerated."

I am quite conscious, that this is a subject in which the generality of Readers will not feel any particular, or lively interest; but when so pious, so highly gifted and greatly learned a divine, as, confessedly, was Bishop Lowth did not think it beneath him to say, that he "venerated the memory of my excellent Ancestor," I trust *I* shall be forgiven for venerating his memory also, and for having entered at length on the foregoing particulars; not so much from the mere desire of proving the correctness of my own former narration, as to evince the high reverence, in which I hold the erudite and pious character, the useful life and labours of my admirable progenitor.

I will only add, that having compared the Life, as published in "Dr. Lempriere's Universal Biography" with that written by myself, in 1798, and which was then inserted in "Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary," I believe that Dr. Lempriere fell into the errors he has committed, either by misunderstanding what I had stated on the subject, or perhaps by intending only a little to change the phraseology, and thereby unconsciously varying the actual circumstances.

Before, however, I close this biographical account, I think it may be acceptable to the Reader to have laid

before him a few private letters, which were written by the Author, after he had left the University, to Dr. Arthur Charlett, who was then Master of University College, having been elected to that situation in 1692, at which time my Great-grandfather was a Fellow of the Society.

As, unfortunately, I do not possess any of the original letters of my Ancestor, I have extracted these, which follow, from a publication, in three volumes octavo, by John Aubrey, Esq., entitled, "Letters written by Eminent Persons of the 17th and 18th Centuries;" of which the originals are in the Bodleian Library, or Ashmolean Museum of the University of Oxford.—I have a letter from the eminent Dr. Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, to my Great-grandfather, which I am also desirous of publishing in further testimony of the high esteem, in which the Author of *Origines Ecclesiasticæ* was held by the most distinguished and respected members of the Church, whatever their political or religious tenets on particular points might happen to be.

It has been said, perhaps with truth, that an idea of the temper, habits, and talents of a man may be as easily conceived by an attention to the style of his epistolary correspondence, and a close examination of his hand-writing, as from a view of his portrait. With reference to this opinion, and as no painted resemblance

of my Ancestor exists, I have determined on inserting the following letter, though of a private and familiar nature, written by him to Dr. Charlett; and I now also present to the public a Lithographic *Fac-simile* of the hand-writing of the learned Author, that it may be placed as a Frontispiece to the first volume of this Edition.

RICHARD BINGHAM.

New House, Gosport, 1829.

From the Right Rev. Dr. GILBERT BURNET, LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY, *to the Rev.* JOSEPH BINGHAM, *Rector of Worthy.*

REVEREND SIR,

I humbly thank you for the kind advertisement, that you were pleased to send me, of the instrument passed in the University of Oxford. I met with a box full of such instruments under hand and seal, since I published my work, of which I gave a general intimation in the History of the Parliament 25 Henry 8; but I shall be glad to reserve a further account of any particulars as my friends can pick them up, and will readily own the obligation, that you offer to lay on me in this matter, and shall be very glad to have an opportunity given me to let you see, how much I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your most humble servant,

GI. SARUM.

Salisbury, 25th May, 1706.

On the back of this letter there is written, in the hand-writing of Mr. Joseph Bingham, the following Memorandum :—

"Search Registr. Actor. in Archiv. Oxon. an. 1534, p. 127, for the instrument mentioned."

From the Rev. JOSEPH BINGHAM, *to the Rev. Dr.* CHARLETT, *Master of University College, Oxford.*

HONOURED SIR,

Having this opportunity I could not but lay hold of it to return you my thanks for your last remembrance of me from London. Sir P. Sydenham called upon me in his journey, and bought some books of me at Winton, where I have lately disposed of Dr. Sayer's study among friends, finding it as profitable to sell books as to write them, though I have made a shift to send another volume now to the press. Mr. Sone desired me to recommend the bearer to your favour to be Bible Clerk the next vacancy, assuring me that he was both a sober youth and a tolerably good scholar, and, if you have not disposed of the place, I should be glad to hear that you think him worthy of an office, which contributed in part to my own education.—We expect two new members for the county, Sir Simeon Stuart and Mr. Pit, who are in the poll four or 500 voters before their competitors here at Winton, and it is supposed they will rather gain than lose in the Isle of Wight. This is all the present news this place affords. I would have had my bookseller to have printed a little set of maps of Ecclesiastical Geography, about ten or twelve, to have gone along with my next book, but he is not willing to venture upon it, without assurance of subscriptions, or the like, so I must let it drop, which I am sorry for, because I take it to be an useful thing for all that read ancient Church History. I am, with all due respects, your obliged friend and servant,

J. BINGHAM.

All Saints Day, 1710.

From the Same to the Same.

HONOURED SIR,

I sent you the second part of the Scholast. Hist. of Lay Baptism, which I desire you to accept, as a testimony of my respect, though the subject should happen to be disagreeable to your opinion. I still preserve my old friends and their favour, the Bishop of Rochester, &c. though we differ in our sentiments upon this point; and though I meet with some rebukes, as you find in the Preface, from rude persons; yet they are trifles to me, who am conscious of nothing but defending the Church's Practice. My last journey to London proved very successful. I waited upon my Lord Treasurer,* without any other introduction, but my book in my hand. He received me very kindly, and invited me to dine with him the next day, when he surprized me before dinner with a present of a Bank-bill of an £100, as an encouragement to go on with the Antiquities of the Church, with which he expresses himself very much pleased. I believe, I am obliged to the kind offices of Dr. Arbuthnot, who has been very friendly in recommending me to my Lord upon his personal acquaintance, and I beg of you, when you see him next, to give him thanks in my name for his kind remembrance of me. I desire you also to give my service to the Dean of Christ Church, and Dr. Potter, when you see them. My respects to all the Society. I am your affectionate friend and humble servant,

JOS. BINGHAM.

Winton, Nov. 9, 1713.

* Lord Treasurer Harley, created in the Reign of Queen Anne, Baron Wigmore and Earl of Oxford and Mortimer.

From the Same to the Same.

HONOURED SIR,

I happened the other day to see Dr. Radcliff's Picture, engraved by M. Burgher, where among other things I found the Rectory of King's Worthy mentioned, as given to Univ. Coll. I was much surprized at the mistake, because that is another parish, in which the Doctor had no concern, for the patronage belongs to my Lady Russel. The Doctor's will has it right, as I remember, Headborn-Worthy, al. Mortimer Worthy. And so it is called in the Valor. Mortimer Worthy, and distinguished from Worthy-Regis and Worthy-Martyris, which are different parishes. There is also Abbot's Worthy, but that is only a tithing belonging to King's Worthy. The common name of our parish is Headborn Worthy, and so I have always called it in the title-page of my books, whenever I had occasion to mention it. I cannot but wonder the person, who was employed in giving an account of the Doctor's benefactions, should make such a mistake against so many evidences, or at least should not consult you, before it was printed, who could have better informed him. We have lately had a very good benefactor die in this place, who was pleased to make me one of his executors in trust. He gives £15 per ann. to a Charity School; £10 per ann. for reading evening prayer at St. Lawrence Church in this city; £75 per ann. for augmentation of poor livings throughout the nation. And the care of all these is committed in trust to the Dean and Chapter of Winton, who are to keep the £75 till it amounts, by four years' income, to the sum of £300, and then join it to the Queen's Bounty of £200 to make a perpetual settlement

upon each church. He has likewise given £200 to Magdalen Hospital near this place; £100 to the poor of Aston in Derbyshire, and the remainder of his estate, after debts and legacies are paid, to the poor of Winton. He gave one of his servants £200, and to his two executors £50 each. His name was Mr. Joseph Percival, once a Spanish merchant. He died worth about £6,000, and I think out of such a sum his benefactions are as considerable as most of those which the present age affords. I thought this short account might not be unacceptable to you, and therefore I give you the trouble of reading it; who am, your obliged friend and humble servant,

JOS. BINGHAM.

Winton, Oct. 11, 1715.

The Writer of the foregoing letters resided, during the period at which they were written, in the Close at Winchester, that he might the more conveniently have recourse to the Library of the Cathedral Church.

R. B.—ED.

It may be well to mention an inaccuracy, which I have committed in a note at the bottom of page 291 of the 8th Vol. where I describe the Dean of St. Paul's, mentioned by my Ancestor, as having been "Dr. Sherlock, afterwards Bishop of London."—The fact was not so. Dr. *William* Sherlock was the Dean of St. Paul's there alluded to, who never became Bishop of London. It was his son, Dr. *Thomas* Sherlock, who, at a subsequent period, was Prelate of that See.

R. B.—ED.

ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ;

OR, THE

ANTIQUITIES

OF

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK I.

OF THE SEVERAL NAMES AND ORDERS OF MEN IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the several Titles and Appellations of Christians, which they owned, and distinguished themselves by.

SECT. 1.—Christians at first called Jesseans, and *Therapeutæ*, Πιστοὶ, ἐκλεκτοὶ, &c.

WHEN Christianity was first planted in the world, they, who embraced it, were commonly known among themselves by the names of disciples, believers, elect, saints, and brethren, before they assumed the title and appellation of Christians. Epiphanius[1] says they were also called Ἰεσσαῖοι, Jesseans; either from Jesse, the father of David, or, which is more probable, from the name of the Lord Jesus. He adds, that Philo speaks of them under this appellation in his book περὶ Ἰεσσαίων, which he affirms to be no other but Christians, who went by that name in Egypt, whilst St. Mark preached the Gospel at Alexandria. This book of Philo's is now extant under another title; περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, *Of the Contemplative Life;* and so it is cited by Eusebius,[2] who is also of opinion, that it is nothing but a description of the Christians in Egypt, whom he calls *Therapeutæ*, which signifies either worshippers of the true God, or spiritual physicians, who undertook

[1] Epiphan. Hær. 29. n. 4.

[2] Euseb. Hist. lib. ii. c. 17.

to cure men's minds of all vicious and corrupt affections. But whether this name was invented by Philo, as most proper to express their way of living, or was then the common name of believers in Egypt, before the name Christian was spread over all the world, Eusebius does not undertake to determine. However, he concludes it was a name given to the Christians; and St. Jerom[1] is so positive in it, that for this reason he gives Philo a place in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, telling us, that he wrote a book concerning the first church of St. Mark at Alexandria.

Some learned critics of the last age, call this whole matter[2] into question, but their arguments are answered by others[3] as learned; and therefore I shall enter no further into this dispute, but refer the reader, that is curious, thither for satisfaction. That, which I here take notice of further, is only this; that these names, *Therapeutæ* and *Jessæi*, were scarce ever used in after-ages; but the other names, Ἅγιοι, Πιστοὶ, Ἐκλεκτοὶ, *saints, believers, elect*, &c., occur frequently in ecclesiastical writers, and signify, not any select number of Christians, (as now the words saints and elect are often used to signify only the predestinate,) but all Christians in general, who were entered into the communion of the Church by the waters of baptism. For so Theodoret[4] and others explain the word Ἅγιοι, *saints*, to be such as were vouchsafed the honour and privilege of baptism.

SECT. 2.—*Of the technical names,* ΙΧΘΥΣ *and* *Pisciculi.*

And upon this account, because the Christian life took its original from the waters of baptism, and depended upon the observance of the covenant made therein, the Christians were wont to please themselves with the artificial name *pisciculi, fishes*, to denote, as Tertullian[5] words it, that they were regenerate, or born again into Christ's religion by water, and could not be saved but by continuing therein; and this name was the rather chosen by them, because the initial letters of

---

[1] Hieron. de Scriptor. c. 21. [2] Scaliger et Valesius in Euseb. lib. ii. c. 17. Dallæus de Jejun. et Quadrages. lib. ii. c. 4. [3] Bevereg. Cod. Can. Vind. lib. iii. c. 5. n. 4. [4] Theodor. Com. in Philip. i. 1. [5] Tertul. de Bapt. c. 1. Nos Pisciculi secundum ἰχθῦν nostrum Jesum Christum in aquâ nascimur; nec aliter quam in aquâ permanendo salvi sumus.

our Saviour's names and titles in Greek, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστὸς, Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, Σωτὴρ, *Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Saviour*, technically put together, make up the name ΙΧΘΥΣ, which signifies a fish, and is alluded to both by Tertullian, and Optatus.[1]

SECT. 3.—Christians, why called *Gnostici*.

Sometimes Christians also style themselves by the name of Gnostics, Γνωστικοὶ, *men of understanding and knowledge*; because the Christian religion was the truest wisdom, and the knowledge of the most divine and heavenly things. This name was aped and abused by a perverse sort of heretics, who are commonly known and distinguished by the name of Gnostics, because of their great pretences to knowledge and science, falsely so called. Yet this did not hinder but that the Christians sometimes laid claim to it, as having indeed the only just and proper right to make use of it. For which reason Clemens Alexandrinus,[2] in all his writings, gives the Christian philosopher the appellation of Γνωστικός. Athanasius[3] calls the Ascetics of Egypt, who were of the contemplative life, by the same name, Γνωστικοί; and Socrates tells us, Evagrius Ponticus wrote a book for the use of these Ascetics, which he entitled, The Gnostic, *i. e.* rules for the contemplative life; some fragments of which are yet extant in Socrates,[4] and some others published by Cotelerius, in his Monuments of the Greek Church. In one of these fragments there is mention made of a monk, who is styled Μοναχὸς τῆς Παρεμβολῆς, τῶν Γνωστικῶν ὁ δοκιμώτατος; which the first translators of Socrates, not understanding, render, *A monk, of great renown, of the sect of the Gnostics*, as if he had been one of the Gnostic heretics; whereas it means no more, than a monk of the contemplative life, who inhabited in a village called the Parembole, not far from Alexandria;

---

[1] Optat. cont. Parmen. lib. iii. p. 62. Hic est piscis qui in baptismate per invocationem fontalibus undis inseritur, ut quæ aqua fuerat, a pisce etiam piscina vocitetur. Cujus Piscis nomen, secundum appellationem Græcam in uno nomine per singulas literas turbam sanctorum nominum continet, ἰχθὺς, quod est latine, Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, Salvator. [2] Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 294. Strom. ii. p. 383. Strom. vi. p. 665. Strom. vii. p. 748. [3] Athan. ap. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. c. 23. [4] Socrat. ibid.

being one of those Ascetics, whom Evagrius and all the rest call by the then known name of Christian Gnostics. See Valesius's note upon Socrates.

SECT. 4.—Sometimes called *Theophori* and *Christophori*.

Another name, which frequently occurs in the writings of the ancients, is that of Θεοφόροι, which signifies temples of God, and is as old as Ignatius, who usually gave himself this title; as appears, both from the inscriptions of his Epistles, each of which begins Ἰγνάτιος ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος; as also from the ancient acts of his martyrdom, where[1] the reason of the name is explained in his Dialogue with Trajan; who hearing him style himself Theophorus, asked what that name meant? To which Ignatius replied, that it meant one that carried Christ in his heart. "Dost thou then," said Trajan, "carry him that was crucified in thy heart?" Ignatius answered, "Yes; for it is written, I will dwell in them, and walk in them." Anastasius Bibliothecarius, indeed, gives another reason, why Ignatius was called Theophorus; because he was the child, whom our Saviour took, and set in the midst of his Disciples, laying his hands upon him; and therefore the Apostles would never presume to ordain him again by imposition of hands after Christ. But as Bishop Pearson[2] and others have observed, this was a mere invention of the modern Greeks, from whom Anastasius took it without further enquiry. Much more ridiculous and absurd is the reason, which is assigned by Vincentius[3] Bellovacensis and some others; that Ignatius was so called, because the name of Jesus Christ was found written in golden letters in his heart. Both these fancies are sufficiently refelled by the genuine acts of his martyrdom; which give a more rational account of the name, and such, as plainly intimates, that it was no peculiar title of Ignatius, but common to him with all other Christians; as, indeed, Bishop Pearson does abundantly prove from several passages of Clemens Alexandrinus, Gregory Nazianzen, Palladius, Eulogius, Theodoret, Cyril of

---

[1] Acta Ignat. ap. Grabe Spicil. T. ii. p. 10. [2] Pearson Vind. Ignat. Par. ii. c. 12. p. 397. Cave's Life of Ignatius. Grabe Spicil. T. ii. p. 2. [3] Vincent. Specul. lib. x. c. 7.

Alexandria, Photius, Maximus, and others. Particularly Clemens[1] assigns the same reason of the name as Ignatius does; that the Christian is therefore called Θεοφορῶν and Θεοφορούμενος, because, as the Apostle says, he is the temple of God. We sometimes also meet with the name *Christophori* in the same sense; as in the epistle of Phileas, Bishop of Thumis, recorded by Eusebius, where, speaking of the martyrs of his own time, he gives them the title of χριστοφόροις μάρτυρες,[2] because they were temples of Christ, and acted by his Holy Spirit.

SECT. 5.—Sometimes, but very rarely, *Christi*.

St. Ambrose, in one place, gives them the name of *Christi*, in a qualified sense; alluding to the signification of the word *Christus* in Scripture, where it sometimes signifies any one that is anointed with oil, or receives any commission from God by a spiritual unction; in which sense every Christian is the Lord's anointed: and therefore, he says, it is no injury[3] for the servant to bear the character of the lord, nor for the soldier to be called by the name of his general; forasmuch as God himself hath said, "Touch not mine anointed, or my Christs, *Christos meos*," as now the vulgar translation reads it, (Psal. cv. 15); and St. Jerom, also, who, in his notes upon the place,[4] observes, that all men are called Christs, who are anointed with the Holy Ghost, as the ancient patriarchs before the law, who had no other unction. Yet we do not find, that the Christians generally took this name upon them, but rather reserved it to their Lord, as his peculiar name and title.

SECT. 6.—Christians great enemies to all party names and human appellations.

Yet it is very observable that in all the names they chose, there was still some peculiar relation to Christ and God,

---

[1] Clem. Strom. lib. vii. p. 748. [2] Euseb. lib. viii. c. 10. [3] Ambros. de Obit. Valentin. T. iii. p. 12. Nec injuriam putes, Characteri Domini inscribuntur et Servuli, et nomine Imperatoris signantur Milites. Denique et ipse Dominus dixit, Nolite tangere Christos meos. [4] Hieron. Com. in Psal. 104. Ecce ante Legem Patriarchæ non uncti Regali unguento, Christi dicuntur. Christi autem sunt, qui Spiritu Sancto unguntur.

from whom they would be named, and not from any mortal man, how great or eminent soever. Party names and human appellations they ever professed to abhor. "We take not our denomination from men," says Chrysostom;[1] "we have no leaders, as the followers of Marcion, or Manichæus, or Arius." "No," says Epiphanius,[2] "the Church was never called so much as by the name of any apostle: we never heard of Petrians, or Paulians, or Bartholomæans, or Thaddæans; but only of Christians, from Christ." "I honour Peter," says another father,[3] "but I am not called a Petrian; I honour Paul, but I am not called a Paulian: I cannot bear to be named from any man, who am the creature of God." They observe that this was only the property of sects and heresies, to take party names, and denominate themseves from their leaders. The great and venerable name of Christians was neglected by them, whilst they profanely divided themselves into human appellations, as Gregory Nyssen[4] and Nazianzen complain. Thus Basil observes,[5] how the Marcionites and Valentinians rejected the name of Christians to be called after the names of Marcion and Valentinus, their leaders. Optatus[6] and St. Austin[7] bring the same charge against the Donatists. Optatus says, it was the usual question of Donatus to all foreigners; *Quid apud vos agitur de parte meâ? How go the affairs of my party among you?* And the bishops who were his followers, were used to subscribe themselves, *Ex parte Donati*. Epiphanius observes the same of the Audians,[8] Colluthians, and Arians; and he tells us more particularly of Meletius and his followers,[9] that, having formed a schism, they left the old name of the Catholic Church, and styled themselves by a distinguishing character, "the Church of the Martyrs," with an invidious design to cast a reproach upon all others that were not of their party. In like manner, as the

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. 33. in Act. [2] Epiphan. Hær. 42. Marcionit. Item. Hær. 10. [3] Greg. Naz. Orat. 31. p. 506. See also Athan. Orat. 2. contra Arian. Greg. Nyss. de Perfect. Christ. t. iii. p. 276. [4] Nyss. contra Apollin. t. iii. p. 261. Naz. Orat. ad Episcop. [5] Basil. Com. in Psal. 48. p. 245. [6] Optat. lib. iii. p. 66. [7] Aug. Ep. 68. ad Januar. [8] Epiph. Hær. 70. Audianor. Id. Hær. 69. Arian. [9] Epiph. Hær. 68. Meletian.

Arians styled themselves Lucianists[1] and Conlucianists, pretending to follow the doctrine of Lucian the martyr.

But the Church of Christ still kept to the name of Christian. This was the name they gloried in as most expressive of their unity and relation to Christ. Eusebius[2] records a memorable story, out of the epistle of the churches of Lyons and Vienna, in France, concerning one Sanctus, a deacon of the church of Vienna, who suffered in the persecution under Antonine; That, being put to the rack, and examined by the magistrates concerning his name, his country, his city, his quality, whether he were bond or free, his answer to all their questions was, "I am a Christian." This, he said, was to him both name, and city, and kindred, and every thing; nor could the heathen, with all their skill, extort any other answer from him. St. Chrysostom[3] gives the like account of the behaviour of Lucian the martyr before his persecutors; and there are some other instances of the same nature, by which we may judge, how great a veneration they had for the name Christian.

SECT. 7.—Of the name Catholic, and its antiquity.

The importunity of heretics made them add another name to this; viz., that of Catholic, which was, as it were, their sirname or characteristic, to distinguish them from all sects, who, though they had party names, yet sometimes sheltered themselves under the common name of Christians. This we learn from Pacian's epistle[4] to Sempronian, the Novatian heretic, whom, demanding of him the reason why Christians called themselves Catholics, he answers, that it was to discern them from heretics, who went by the name of Christians. "Christian is my name," says he, "and Catholic my sirname: the one is my title, the other my character or mark of distinction." Heretics commonly confined religion, either to a particular region, or some select party of men, and therefore had no pretence to style themselves Catholics: but the

---

[1] Theodor. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 5. Epiphan. Hær. 69. Arian. [2] Euseb. lib. v. c. 1. [3] Chrysost. Homil. 46. in Lucian. t. i. p. 602. [4] Pacian. Ep. i. ad Sempronian. Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus Cognomen. Illud me nuncupat, Istud ostendit.

Church of Christ had a just title to this name, being called Catholic (as Optatus[1] observes) because it was universally diffused over all the world; and in this sense the name is as ancient almost as the Church itself. For we meet with it in the passion of Polycarp[2] in Eusebius, in Clemens[3] Alexandrinus, and Ignatius;[4] and so great a regard had they for this name, that they would own none to be Christians, who did not profess themselves to be of the Catholic Church; as we may see in the [5]Acts of Pionius the martyr, who being asked by Polemo, the judge, "of what Church he was," answered, "I am of the Catholic Church; for Christ has no other."

SECT. 8.—In what sense the name, Ecclesiastics, was given to all Christians.

I must here observe further, that the name of Ecclesiastics was sometimes attributed to all Christians in general. For though this was a peculiar name of the clergy, as contradistinct from the laity, in the Christian Church, yet, when Christians in general are spoken of in opposition to Jews, infidels, and heretics, then they have all the name of Ecclesiastics, or men of the Church, as being neither of the Jewish synagogues, nor of the heathen temples, nor heretical conventicles, but members of the Church of Christ. In this sense ἀνδρὲς ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ is often used by Eusebius[6] and Cyril[7] of Jerusalem; and Valesius[8] observes the same in Origen, Epiphanius, St. Jerom, and others.

SECT. 9.—The Christian religion called Δόγμα, and Christians, οἱ τῶ Δόγματος.

Sometimes also we find the word Δόγμα put absolutely to signify the Christian religion, as Chrysostom[9] and Theodoret[10] say, St. Paul himself uses the word in his Epistle to the

---

[1] Optat. lib. ii. p. 46. Cum inde dicta sit Catholica, quod sit rationalis et ubique diffusa. [2] Euseb. lib. iv. c. 15. [3] Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii. [4] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. [5] Act. Pionii ap. Baron. an. 254. n. 9. Cujus, inquit Polemo, es Ecclesiæ? Respondit Pionius, Chatolicæ: Nulla enim est alia apud Christum. [6] Euseb. lib. iv. c. 7. lib. v. cap. 27. [7] Cyril. Catech. 15. n. 4. [8] Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. ii. cap. 25. [9] Chrys. Hom. v. in Ephes. [10] Theod. Com. in Ephes. ii. 15.

esians, ii. 15. Estius[1] assures us, it was the common in-
retation of all ancient expositors, both Greek and Latin,
a that place. Hence it was that Christians were called
etimes, ὁι τȣ̃ Δόγματος, *men of the faith*, meaning the
of Christ. As in the rescript of Aurelian, the Emperor,
nst Paulus Samosatensis, recorded by[2] Eusebius, the
ops of Italy and Rome are styled, Ἐπίσκοποι τȣ̃ δόγματος,
ops of the faith, that is, the Christian faith.

Sect. 10.—Christians called Jews by the Heathens.

he heathens also were used to confound the names of
s and Christians together; whence, in heathen authors,
name of Jews by mistake is often given to the Christians.
s Dio, in the life of Domitian,[3] speaking of Acilius Gla-
, a man of consular dignity, says, he was accused of
ism, and put to death for turning to the Jews religion;
ch, as Baronius[4] and others observe, must mean the
istian religion, for which he was a martyr. So, when
tonius[5] says, that Claudius expelled the Jews from
ne, because they grew tumultuous by the instigations
Chrestus, it is generally concluded by learned[6] men,
under the name of Jews he also comprehends the
istians. In like manner when Spartian[7] says of Cara-
a's play-fellow, that he was of the Jewish religion, he
btless means the Christian; for as much as Tertullian[8]
us, that Caracalla himself was nursed by a Christian.

r. 11.—Christ by the heathens commonly called Chrestus, and Christians, Chrestians.

The heathens committed another mistake in the pro-
ciation of our Saviour's name, whom they generally
ed Chrestus, instead of Christus; and his followers Chres-
s for Christians; which is taken notice of by Justin

Est. Com. in Eph. ii. 14. [2] Euseb. Lib. vii. c. 30. [3] Dio in
it. [4] Baron. an. lcxiv. n. 1. [5] Sueton. Claud. c. 26. Judæos
ulsore Chresto assiduè tumultuantes Roma expulit. [6] Hotting.
. Eccl. T. i. p. 37. Basnag. Exerc. in Baron. p. 139. Selden, de Synedr.
i. c. 8. who cites Lipsius, Petavius, and many others. [7] Spartian.
racal. c. 1. [8] Tertul. ad Scapul. c. 4. Lacte Christiano educatus.

Martyr,[1] Tertullian,[2] Lactantius,[3] and some others, who correct their mistake; though they have no great quarrel with them upon this account, for both names are of good signification. Christus is the same with the Hebrew Messias, and signifies, a person anointed to be a Priest or King; and Chrestus, being the same with the Greek Χρηστὸς, implies sweetness and goodness. Whence Tertullian[4] tells them, that they were unpardonable for prosecuting Christians merely for their name, because both names were innocent, and of excellent signification.

The Christians, therefore, did not wholly reject this name, though it was none of their own imposing; as neither did they refuse to be called Jews, in that sense as the Scripture uses the word, to distinguish the people of God from the synagogue of satan, Rev. ii. 9. Though to avoid the subtilties of the Ebionites and Nazarens, who were for blending the ceremonies of the law with the faith of the gospel, they rather chose to avoid that name, and stuck to the name of Christians.

CHAP. II.

Of the names of reproach which the Jews, Infidels, and Heretics cast upon the Christians.

SECT. 1.—Christians called Nazarens by the Jews and Heathens.

BESIDES the names already spoken of, there were some other reproachful names cast upon them by their adversaries, which it will not be improper here to mention. The first of these was Nazarens, a name of reproach given them first by the Jews, by whom they are styled, "the sect of the Nazarens," Acts, xxiv. 5. There was, indeed, a particular heresy,

---

[1] Just. M. Apol. 2. [2] Tertul. Apol. c. 3. [3] Lact. Lib. iv. c. 7.
[4] Tertul. ibid. Christianus quantum interpretatio est, de Unctione deducitur. Sed et cum perperam Chrestianus pronunciatur a vobis (nam nec Nominis certa est notitia penes vos) de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est. Oditur ergo in hominibus innocuis etiam nomen innocuum.

three times a day, morning, noon, and evening, when met in their synagogues to pray, in this direful form tecration, ἐπικαταρᾶσαι ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς Ναζωραίους, *send thy*, *O God, upon the Nazarens.* But St. Jerom[3] says, was levelled at Christians in general, whom they thus ematized under the name of Nazarens. This seems most able, because as both St. Jerom[3] and Epiphanius, himself,[4] rve, the Jews termed all Christians, by way of reproach, rens; and the Gentiles took it from the Jews, as appears that of Datianus, the Prætor, in Prudentius,[5] where, king to the Christians, he gives them the name of rens. Some[6] think the Christians at first were very to own this name, and esteemed it no reproach, till time as the heresy of the Nazarens broke out, and in detestation of that heresy they forsook that name, called themselves Christians, Acts, xi. 26. But whethis be said according to the exact rules of chronology, ve those who are better skilled to determine.

Sect. 2.—And Galilæans.

nother name of reproach was that of Galilæans, which Julian's ordinary style, whenever he spake of Christ or stians. Thus in his dialogue with old Maris, a blind stian bishop, mentioned by Sozomen,[7] he told him by of scoff, "Thy Galilæan God will not cure thee." And, in his epistle[8] to Arsacius, high priest of Galatia

"the Galilæans maintain their own poor and ours also." The like may be observed in Socrates,[1] Theodoret,[2] Chrysostom,[3] and Gregory Nazianzen,[4] who adds, that he not only called them Galilæans himself, but made a law that no one should call them by any other name; thinking thereby to abolish the name of Christians.

Sect. 3.—Also Atheists.

They also called them atheists, and their religion, the atheism or impiety, because they derided the worship of the heathen gods. Dio[5] says, Acilius Glabrio was put to death for atheism, meaning the Christian religion; and the Christian apologists, Athenagoras,[6] Justin Martyr,[7] Arnobius,[8] and others, reckon this among the crimes which the heathens usually lay to their charge. Eusebius says,[9] the name was become so common, that when the persecuting magistrates would oblige a Christian to renounce his religion, they bad him abjure it in this form, by saying among other things, *αἶρε τὸς Ἀθέους, confusion to the atheists, away with the impious,*—meaning the Christians.

Sect. 4.—And Greeks and Impostors.

To this they added the name of Greeks and impostors; which is noted by St. Jerom,[10] who says, wheresoever they saw a Christian, they would presently cry out *ὁ γραικὸς ἐπιθέτης, behold a Grecian impostor!* This was the character which the Jews gave our Saviour, *ὁ πλανος, that deceiver.* Mat. xxvii. 63. And Justin[11] Martyr says, they endeavoured to propagate it to posterity, sending their apostles or emissaries from Jerusalem to all the synagogues in the world, to bid them beware of a certain impious, lawless, sect, lately risen up under one Jesus, a Galilæan impostor. Hence Lucian[12] took occasion in his blasphemous raillery

---

[1] Socrat. lib. iii. c. 12. [2] Theodor. lib. iii. c. 7. and 21. [3] Chrys. Hom. lxiii. Tom. 5. [4] Naz. i. Invectiv. [5] Dio in Domitian. [6] Athen. Legat. pro Christ. [7] Just. Apol. i. p. 47. [8] Arnob. lib. i. [9] Euseb. lib. iv. c. 15. [10] Hieron. Ep. x. ad Furiam. Ubicunque viderint Christianum, statim illud de Trivio, ὁ γραικὸς ἐπιθέτης, vocant Impostorem. [11] Justin. Dial. Tryph. p. 335. [12] Lucian. Peregrin.

to style him, the crucified sophister. And Celsus[1] commonly gives him and his followers the name of γοητεῖ, *deceivers*. So Asclepiades, the judge in Prudentius,[2] compliments them with the appellation of sophisters; and Ulpian[3] proscribes them in a law by the name of impostors.

The reason why they added the name of Greeks to that of impostors, was (as learned men[4] conjecture) because many of the Christian philosophers took upon them the Grecian or philosophic habit, which was the περιβόλαιον, or *pallium*. Whence the Greeks were called *Palliati*, as the Romans were called *Togati*, or *Gens Togata*, from their proper habit, which was the *toga*. Now it being some offence to the Romans to see the Christians quit the Roman gown, to wear the Grecian cloak; they thence took occasion to mock and deride them with the scurrilous names of Greeks, and Grecian impostors. Tertullian's book, *de Pallio*, was written to show the spiteful malice of this foolish objection.

Sect. 5.—Magicians.

But the heathens went one step farther in their malice; and because our Saviour and his followers did many miracles, which they imputed to evil arts and the power of magic, they therefore generally declaimed against them as magicians, and under that character exposed them to the fury of the vulgar. Celsus[5] and others pretended that our Saviour studied magic in Egypt; and St. Austin[6] says, it was generally believed among the heathen, that he wrote some books about magic too, which he delivered to Peter and Paul for the use of his disciples. Hence it was that Suetonius,[7] speaking in the language of his party, calls the Christians, *Genus hominum superstitionis maleficæ, the men of the magical superstition*. As Asclepiades, the judge

---

[1] Cels. ap. Orig. lib. i. p. 6. [2] Prudent. περὶ στεφ. Carm 9. de Romano Mart. Quis hos Sophistas error invexit novus? &c. [3] Digest. lib. 1. Tit. xiii. c. 1. Si incantavit, si inprecatus est, si (ut vulgari verbo Impostorum utar) exorcisavit. [4] Kortholt de Morib. Christian. c. iii. p. 23. Baron. an. lvi. n. 11. [5] Origen. cont. Cels. lib. ii. Arnobius, lib. i. p. 36. [6] Aug. de Consensu Evang. lib. i. c. 9. [7] Sueton. Neron. c. 16.

in Prudentius,[1] styles St. Romanus, the martyr, arch-magician. And St. Ambrose observes in the Passion of St. Agnes,[2] how the people cryed out against her, "Away with the sorceress! away with the enchanter!" Nothing being more common, than to term all Christians, especially such as wrought miracles,[3] by the odious name of sorcerers and magicians.

SECT. 6.—The New Superstition.

The New Superstition was another name of reproach for the Christian religion. Suetonius gives it that title,[4] and Pliny and Tacitus add to it[5] the opprobrious terms, of wicked and unreasonable superstition. By which name also Nero triumphed over it, in his trophies, which he set up at Rome, when he had harrassed the Christians with a most severe persecution. He gloried that he had purged the country of robbers, and those that obtruded and inculcated the new superstition[6] upon mankind. By this there can be no doubt he meant the Christians, whose religion is called the superstition in other inscriptions of the like nature. See that of Diocletian, cited in Baronius, an. 304, from Occo. *Superstitione Christianorum ubique deleta, &c.*

Not much unlike this was that other name which Porphiry[7] and some others give it, when they call it, the barbarous, new, and strange religion. In the acts of the famous martyrs of Lyons, who suffered under Antoninus Pius, the heathens scornfully insult it with this character. For having burnt the martyrs to ashes, and scattered their remains into the river Rhone, they said, they did it to cut off their hopes of a resurrection, upon the strength of which they sought to obtrude[8] the new and strange religion upon

---

[1] Prudent. περὶ στεφ. Hymn. 9. de. S. Romano. Quousque tandem summus hic nobis Magus illudit? [2] Ambr. Serm. 90. in S. Agnen. Tolle Magam! Tolle Maleficam! [3] See Kortholt de Morib. Christ. c. 4. [4] Sueton. Nero. c. 16. [5] Plin. lib. 10. Ep. 97. Nihil aliud inveni, quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam. Tacit. Annal. xv. c. 44. Exitiabilis superstitio. [6] Inscrip. Antiq. ad Calcem Sueton. Oxon. NERONI. CLAUD. CAIS. AUG. PONT. MAX. OB. PROVINC. LATRONIB. ET. HIS. QUI. NOVAM. GENERI. HUM. SUPERSTITION. INCULCAB. PURGAT.
[7] Ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. 19. Βάρβαρον τόλμημα. [8] Act. Mart. Lugd. ap. Euseb. lib. v. c. 1. Θρησκείαν ξένην καὶ καινήν.

mankind; but now let us see whether they will rise again, and whether their God can help and deliver them out of our hands.

SECT. 7.—Christians, why called Sibyllists.

Celsus gives them the name of Sibyllists,[1] because the Christians, in their disputes with the heathens, sometimes made use of the authority of Sibylla, their own prophetess, against them; whose writings they urged with so much advantage to the Christian cause, and prejudice to the heathen, that Justin Martyr[2] says, the Roman governors made it death for any one to read them, or Hystaspes, or the writings of the prophets.

SECT. 8.—Biathanati.

They also reproached them with the appellation of Βιαθάνατοι, *self-murderers*, because they readily offered themselves up to martyrdom, and cheerfully underwent any violent death, which the heathens could inflict upon them. With what eagerness they courted death, we learn not only from the Christian[3] writers themselves, but from the testimonies of the heathens[4] concerning them. Lucian[5] says, they not only despised death, but many of them voluntarily offered themselves to it, out of a persuasion that they should be made immortal, and live for ever. This he reckons folly, and therefore gives them the name of Κακοδαίμονες; *the miserable wretches that threw away their lives.* In which sense Porphiry[6] also stiles the Christian religion, Βάρβαρον τόλμημα, *the barbarous boldness.* As Arrius Antoninus[7] terms the professors of it, ὦ δειλοὶ, *the stupid wretches*, that had such a mind to die; and the heathen, in Minucius,[8] *homines deploratæ ac desperatæ factionis, the men of the forlorn and desperate faction;* all of which agrees with the name *Biathanati*, or *Biæothanati*, as Baronius[9] understands

---

[1] Origen. c. Cels. lib. v. p. 272. [2] Just. Apol. ii. p. 82. [3] See these collected in Pearson Vind. Ignat. par. ii. c. ix. p. 384. [4] Arrius Antonin. ap. Tertul. ad Scap. c. 4. Tiberian. in Joh. Malela Chronic. [5] Lucian. de Mort. Peregrin. [6] Porphir. ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. vi. c. 19. [7] Tertul. ibid. [8] Minuc. Octav. p. 25. [9] Baron. an. 138. n. 5.

it. Though it may signify not only self-murderers, but (as a learned critic[1] notes) men that expect to live after death. In which sense the heathens probably might use it likewise, to ridicule the Christian doctrine of the resurrection; on which, they knew, all their fearless and undaunted courage was founded. For so the same heathen, in Minucius, endeavours to expose at once both their resolution and their belief. "O strange folly and incredible madness!" says he, "they despise all present torments, and yet fear those that are future and uncertain; they are afraid of dying after death, but in the mean time do not fear to die. So vainly do they flatter themselves, and allay their fears, with the hopes of some reviving comforts after death." For one of these reasons then they gave them the name of *Biothanati*, which word expressly occurs in some of the Acts of the ancient martyrs. Baronius observes,[2] out of Bede's Martyrology, that when the seven sons of Symphorosa were martyred under Hadrian, their bodies were all cast into one pit together, which the temple priests named from them, *Ad septem Biothanatos, the grave of the seven Biothanati.*

Sect. 9.—Parabolarii, and Desperati.

For the same reasons they gave them the names of *Parabolarii* and *Desperati, the bold and desperate men.* The *Parabolarii* or *Parabolani* among the Romans, were those bold adventurous men, who hired out themselves to fight with wild beasts upon the stage or amphitheatre, whence they had also the name of *Bestiarii* and *Confectores.* Now, because the Christians were put to fight for their lives in the same manner, and they rather chose to do it than deny their religion, they therefore got the name of *Paraboli* and *Parabolani;* which, though it was intended as a name of reproach and mockery, yet the Christians were not unwilling to take it to themselves, being one of the truest characters that the heathens ever gave them. And, therefore, they sometimes gave themselves this name by way of allusion to the Roman Paraboli, as in the passion[3] of Abdo and Senne in the time

[1] Suicer. Thesaur. Ecclesiast. T. i. p. 690. [2] Baron. an. 138. n. 6.
[3] Acta Abdon. et Sennes ap. Suicer.

of Valerian, the martyrs, who were exposed to be devoured by wild beasts in the amphitheatre, are said to enter, *Ut audacissimi Parabolani, as most resolute champions*, that despised their own lives for their religion's sake. But, the other name of *Desperati*, they rejected as a calumny, retorting it back upon their adversaries, who more justly deserved it. "Those," says Lactantius,[1] "who set a value upon their faith, and will not deny their God, they first torment and butcher them with all their might, and then call them Desperadoes because they will not spare their own bodies; as if any thing could be more desperate, than to torture and tear in pieces those whom you cannot but know to be innocent."

SECT. 10.—Sarmentitii, and Semaxii.

Tertullian mentions another name, which was likewise occasioned by their sufferings. The martyrs, which were burnt alive, were usually tied to a board or stake of about six feet long, which the Romans called *Semaxis*; and then they were surrounded or covered with faggots of small wood, which they called *Sarmenta*. From this, their punishment, the heathens, who turned every thing into mockery, gave all Christians the despiteful name of *Sarmentitii* and *Semaxii*.[2]

SECT. 11.—Lucifugax Natio.

The heathen, in Minucius,[3] takes occasion also to reproach them under the name of the sculking generation, or the men that loved to prate in corners and the dark. The ground of which scurrilous reflection was only this, that they were forced to hold their religious assemblies in the night, to avoid the fury of the persecutions; which Celsus[4] himself owns, though otherwise prone enough to load them with hard names and odious reflections.

SECT. 12.—Plautina Prosapia, and Pistores.

The same heathen, in Minucius, gives them one scurrilous

[1] Lact. Instit. lib. v. c. 9. Desperatos vocant, quia corpori suo minimè parcunt, &c. [2] Tertul. Apol. c. 50. Licet nunc Sarmentitios et Semaxios appelletis, quia ad Stipitem dimidii Axis revincti, Sarmentorum ambitu exurimur. [3] Minuc. Octav. p. 25. Latebrosa et Lucifugax Natio, in publicum muta, in angulis garrula. [4] Origen. c. Cels. lib. i. p. 5.

name more, which it is not very easy to guess the meaning of. He calls them *Plautinians*,[1] *Homines Plautinæ Prosapiæ*. Rigaltius[2] takes it for a ridicule upon the poverty and simplicity of the Christians, whom the heathens commonly represented as a company of poor ignorant mechanics, bakers, tailors, and the like; men of the same quality with Plautus, who as St. Jerom[3] observes was so poor, that in a time of famine he was forced to hire out himself to a baker to grind at his mill, during which time he wrote three of his plays in the intervals of his labour. Such sort of men Cæcilius says the Christians were; and therefore he styles Octavius in the dialogue, *Homo Plautinæ Prosapiæ, et Pistorum præcipuus, a Plautinian, a chief man among the illiterate bakers, but no philosopher*. The same reflection is often made by Celsus. "You shall see," says he,[4] "weavers, tailors, fullers, and the most illiterate and rustic fellows, who dare not speak a word before wise men, when they can get a company of children and silly women together, set up to teach strange paradoxes amongst them." "This is one of their rules," says he, again,[5] "let no man that is learned, wise, or prudent come among us; but if any be unlearned, or a child, or an idiot, let him freely come; so they openly declare, that none but fools and sots, and such as want sense, slaves, women, and children are fit disciples for the God they worship."

Sect. 13.—With what Names the Heretics reproached the Orthodox Christians.

Nor was it only the heathens, who thus reviled them, but commonly every perverse sect among the Christians had some reproachful name to cast upon them. The Novatian party called them Cornelians,[6] because they communicated with Cornelius, bishop of Rome, rather than with Novatianus, his antagonist. They also termed them Apostatics, Capitolins, Synedrians, because[7] they charitably decreed in their synods to receive apostates, and such as

---

[1] Minuc. p. 37. Quid ad hæc audet Octavius, homo Plautinæ Prosapiæ, ut Pistorum præcipuus, ita postremus Philosophorum? [2] Rigalt. in Loc.
[3] Hieron. Chronic. an. i. Olymp. 145. [4] Origen. c. Cels. lib. iii. p. 144.
[5] Ibid. p. 137. [6] Eulog. ap. Phot. Cod. 280. [7] Pacian. Ep. 2. ad Sempronian.

went to the capitol to sacrifice, into their communion again, upon their sincere repentance. The Nestorians[1] termed the orthodox, Cyrillians; and the Arians[2] called them Eustathians and Paulinians, from Eustathius and Paulinus, bishops of Antioch; as also Homoousians, because they kept to the doctrine of the ὁμοούσιον, which declared the Son of God to be of the same substance with the Father. The author of the *Opus Imperfectum* on St. Matthew, under the name of Chrysostom,[3] styles them expressly, *Hæresis Homoousianorum, the heresy of the Homoousians.* And so Serapion, in his conflict with Arnobius,[4] calls them Homoousianates, which the printed copy reads corruptly Homuncionates, which was a name for the Nestorians.

SECT. 14.—Christians called *Psychici*, by the Montanists.

The Cataphrygians or Montanists commonly called the orthodox, Ψυχικὸς, *carnal;* because they rejected the prophecies and pretended inspirations of Montanus, and would not receive his rigid laws about fasting, nor abstain from second marriages, nor observe four lents in a year, &c. This was Tertullian's ordinary compliment to the Christians in all his books[5] written after he was fallen into the errors of Montanus. He calls his own party the spiritual, and the orthodox the carnal; and some of his books[6] are expressly entitled, *Adversus Psychicos.* Clemens Alexandrinus[7] observes, the same reproach was also used by other heretics beside the Montanists. And it appears from Irenæus, that this was an ancient calumny of the Valentinians, who styled themselves the spiritual and the perfect, and the orthodox the secular and carnal,[8] who had need of abstinence and good works, which were not necessary for them that were perfect.

---

[1] Ep. Legat. Schismat. ad suos in Epheso in Act. Con. Ephes. Con. T. iii. p. 746. [2] Sozom. lib. vi. c. 21. [3] Opus Imperf. Hom. 48. [4] Conflict. Arnob. et Serap. ad calcem Irenæi. p. 519. [5] Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 1. Nos quidem agnitio Paracleti disjunxit a Psychicis. Id. de Monogam. c. 1. Hæretici nuptias auferunt, Psychici ingerunt. See also c. 11. and 16. [6] De Jejuniis adv. Psychicos. De Pudicitiâ, &c. [7] Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. iv. p. 511. [8] Iren. lib. i. c. 1. p. 29. Nobis quidem, quos Psychicos vocant, et de sæculo esse dicunt, necessariam continentiam, &c.

SECT. 15.—Allegorists, by the Millenaries.

The Millenaries styled them Allegorists, because they expounded the prophecy of the Saints reigning a thousand years with Christ, Rev. xx. 4. to a mystical and allegorical sense. Whence Eusebius[1] observes of Nepos, the Egyptian bishop, who wrote for the Millennium, that he entitled his book, Ἔλεγχος Ἀλληγορισῶν, *a Confutation of the Allegorists.*

SECT. 16.—Chronitæ, by the Aetians; Simplices, by the Manichees; Anthropolatræ, by the Apollinarians.

Aetius, the Arian, gives them the abusive name of Χρονῖται; by which he seems to intimate, that their religion was but temporary, and would shortly have an end; whereas the character was much more applicable to the Arians themselves, whose faith was so lately sprung up in the world; as the author of the Dialogues de Trinitate, under the name of Athanasius, who confutes Aetius,[2] justly retorts upon him.

The Manichees, as they gave themselves the most glorious names of *Electi, Macarii, Catharistæ*, mentioned by[3] St. Austin, so they reproached the Catholics with the most contemptible name of *Simplices, idiots;* which is the term that Manichæus himself used in his dispute[4] with Archelaus, the Mesopotamian bishop, styling the Christian teachers, *Simpliciorum Magistros, guides of the simple;* because they could not relish his execrable doctrine concerning two principles of good and evil.

The Apollinarians were no less injurious to the Catholics, in fixing on them the odious name of *Anthropolatræ, man-worshipers;* because they maintained that Christ was a perfect man, and had a reasonable soul and body, of the same nature with ours, which Apollinarius denied. Gregory Nazianzen[5] takes notice of this abuse, and sharply replies to it; telling the Apollinarians, "that they themselves much better deserved the name of *Sarcolatræ, flesh-worshipers;* for if Christ had no human soul, they must be concluded to worship his flesh only."

---

[1] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 24.
[2] Athan. Dial. 2. de Trinit. T. ii. p. 193.
[3] Aug. de Hær. c. 46.
[4] Archel. Disp. adv. Manichæum ad calcem Sozomen. Ed. Vales. p. 197.
[5] Naz. Ep. i. ad Cledon.

SECT. 17.—Philosarcæ and Pelusiotæ, &c. by the Origenians.

The Origenians, who denied the truth of the resurrection, and asserted that men should have only aerial and spiritual bodies in the next world, made jests upon the Catholics, because they maintained the contrary; that our bodies should be the same individual bodies, and of the same nature that they are now, with flesh and bones, and all the members in the same form and structure, only altered in quality, not in substance. For this they gave them the opprobrious names of *Simplices* and *Philosarcæ*,[1] *idiots and lovers of the flesh; Carnei, Animales, Jumenta, carnal, sensual animals; Lutei, earthy; Pelusiotes*,[2] which is a term of the same importance, from the Greek word, Πῆλος, *Lutum*, as St. Jerom himself[3] explains it. So that though Baronius from some copies reads this name, *Pilosiotæ*, yet the true reading is *Pelusiotæ*, as the passage cited in the margin plainly evinces.

SECT. 18.—The Synagogue of Antichrist and Satan, by the Luciferians.

But of all others the Luciferians gave the Church the rudest language; styling her the brothel-house, and synagogue of Anti-christ and Satan; because she allowed those bishops to retain their honour and places, who were cajoled by the Arians to subscribe the fraudulent confession of the council of Ariminum. The Luciferian, in St. Jerom, runs out in this manner against the Church; and St. Jerom says, "he spake but the sense of the whole party, for this was the ordinary style[4] and language of all the rest."

These are some of those reproachful names, which heretics,

---

[1] Hieron. Ep. 61. ad Pammach. T. ii. p. 171. Nos Simplices et Philosarcas dicere, quòd eadem Ossa, et Sanquis, et Caro, id est, vultus et membra, totiusque compago corporis resurgat in novissimâ die. [2] Id. Ep. 65. ad Pammach et Ocean. de Error. Orig. p. 192. Pelusiotas nos appellant, et luteos, animalesque et carneos, quòd non recipiamus ea quæ spiritus sunt. [3] Id. Com. in Jerem. xxix. p. 407. Quæ cum audiunt Discipuli ejus (Origenis) et Grunniæ Familiæ Stercora, putant se Divina audire Mysteria; nosque quòd ista contemnimus, quasi prò brutis habent animantibus, et vocant πηλωσιώτας, eo quòd in Luto istius corporis constituti, non possimus sentire cœlestia. [4] Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucifer. T. ii. p. 135. Asserebat universum mundum esse Diaboli; et, ut jam familiare est eis dicere, factum de Ecclesiâ Lupanar. - - - - Quòd Antichristi magis Synagoga, quàm Ecclesia Christi debeat nuncupari.

concurring with Jews and infidels, endeavoured to fasten upon the Christian Church; which I should not so much as have mentioned, but that they serve to give some light to antiquity, and therefore were not wholly to be passed over in a treatise of this nature.

CHAP. III.

Of the several Orders of Men in the Christian Church.

SECT. 1.—Three Sorts of Members of the Christian Church, the Ἡγούμενοι, Πιστοὶ, and Κατηχούμενοι.

HAVING given an account of the several names of Christians, I proceed now to speak of the persons, and several orders of men in the Christian Church. Some divide them into three ranks, others into four, others into five; which yet come much to the same account, when they are compared together. Eusebius reckons but three orders, *viz.* the Ἡγούμενοι, Πιστοὶ, and Κατηχούμενοι, *rulers, believers,* and *catechumens.* "There are in every Church," says he, "three orders of men,[1] one of the rulers or guides, and two of those that are subject to them; for the people are divided into two classes; the Πιστοὶ, *believers,* and the unbaptised," by whom he means the catechumens. St. Jerom[2] makes five orders; but then he divides the clergy into three orders to make up the number, reckoning them thus; bishops, presbyters, deacons, believers, and catechumens. In which account he follows Origen,[3] who makes five degrees subordinate to one another in the Church; saying, "Every one shall be punished according to the difference of his degree. If a bishop or president of the Church sins, he shall have the greater punishment. A catechumen will de-

[1] Euseb. Demonst. Evang. lib. vii. c. 2. p. 323. Τρία καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλησίαν τάγματα, ἓν μὲν τὸ τῶν ἡγουμένων, δύο δὲ τὰ τῶν ὑποβεβηκότων. [2] Hieron. Com. in Esai. xix. p. 64. Quinque Eccelesiæ Ordines, Episcopos, Presbyteros, Diaconos, Fideles, Catechumenos. [3] Origen. Hom. 5. in Ezek. Pro modo graduum unusquisque torquebitur. Majorem pœnam habet, qui Ecclesiæ præsidet et delinquit. Annon magis misericordiam promeretur ad comparationem Fidelis, Catechumenus? Non magis veniâ dignus est Laicus, si ad Diaconum conferatur? Et rursus comparatione Presbyteri Diaconus veniam plus meretur.

serve mercy, in comparison of a believer; and a layman in comparison of a deacon; and a deacon in comparison of a presbyter." Here are plainly St. Jerom's five orders; first bishops, under the name of presidents of the Church; then presbyters; after them deacons; then believers, or laymen; and last of all, the catechumens.

SECT. 2.—Believers here strictly taken for the Laity that were baptized.

In all which accounts, these four things are proper to be remarked. 1. That the name believers, Πιστοὶ, and *Fideles*, is here taken, in a more strict sense, only for one order of Christians,—the believing or baptized laity, in contradistinction to the clergy and the catechumens, the two other orders of men in the Church. And in this sense, the words Πιστοὶ and *Fideles* are commonly used in the ancient liturgies,[1] and canons, to distinguish those that were baptized, and allowed to partake of the holy mysteries, from the catechumens; whence came that ancient distinction of the service of the Church into the *Missa Catechumenorum* and *Missa Fidelium*;[2] of which more in its proper place.

SECT. 3.—Catechumens owned as imperfect Members of the Church.

2dly. We may hence observe, that the catechumens, though but imperfect Christians, were in some measure owned to be within the pale of the Church. Forasmuch, as Eusebius, Origen, and St. Jerom reckon them one of the three orders of the Church; and the councils of Eliberis[3] and Constantinople[4] give them expressly the name of Christians; though, as St. Austin[5] says, they were not yet sons, but servants: they belonged to the house of God, but were not yet admitted to all the privileges of it, being only Christians at large, and not in the most strict and proper acceptation.

SECT. 4.—Heretics not reckoned among Christians.

And yet this is more than can be said of heretics, properly

---

[1] See Con. Nic. Can. xi. Con. Eliber. c. 12, 46, 51. Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 34. Cyril. Hierosol. Præf. Catech. n. 2. [2] Con. Carth. iv. c. 84. Con. Valent. Hispan. c. 1. [3] Con. Elib. Can. 39. [4] Con. Const. i. Can. 7. [5] Aug. Tract. 11. in Joh. T. 9. p. 41. Quòd signum Crucis in fronte habent Catechumeni, jam de Domo magnâ sunt, sed fiant ex servis filii. Non enim nihil sunt, quia ad magnam Domum pertinent.

so called; for we may observe, 3dly, That in the fore-mentioned division, heretics come into no account among Christians. They were not esteemed of, either as catechumens or believers, but as mere Jews or pagans; neither having the true faith, nor being willing to learn it. Tertullian[1] says, in general, "if they be heretics, they cannot be Christians;" and St. Jerom,[2] disputing with a Luciferian, says the same in express terms: "That heretics are no Christians; nor to be spoken of but as we would do of heathens." Lactantius[3] specifies in the Montanists, Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Anthropians, Arians, saying, "that they are no Christians who, forsaking the name of Christ, call themselves by other denominations." Athanasius[4] and Hilary[5] say the same of the Arians; that "they are not Christians." Constantine,[6] therefore, enacted it into a law, that they should not be called Christians, but Porphirians, from Porphiry, that infamous heathen, whose practice they so much resembled in their impious blasphemies and reproaches of Christ and the Christian religion. And in imitation of this, Theodosius[7] Junior made another law to the same effect, against Nestorius and his followers, that they should not abuse the name of Christians, but be called Simonians, from Simon Magus, the arch-heretic; to which we may add that decree of the general council of Sardica, in their synodical epistle[8] against the Arians, where they require all Catholics not only to deny the Arian bishops the title of bishops, but even that of Christians; all which evidently proves, that the ancients put a manifest difference betwixt those who were apostates from the faith, and those

---

[1] Tertul. de Præscript. c. 37. Si Hæretici sunt, Christiani esse non possunt. [2] Hieron. Dial. c. Lucif. T. 2. p. 135. Hæretici Christiani non sunt - - - - Igitur præfixum inter nos habemus, de Hæretico sic loquendum sicut de Gentili.

[3] Lact. Instit. lib. 4. c. 30. [4] Athan. Orat. 2. adv. Arian. T. 1. p. 316. Ἀρειανοὶ ὄντες, οὐκ εἰσὶ Χριστιανοὶ. [5] Hilar. ad Const. lib. i. p. 98. Christianus sum, non Arianus. [6] Const. Imp. Ep. ad Episc. ap. Socrat. lib. i. c. 9. [7] Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. de Hæret. c. 66. Damnato portentosæ superstitionis auctore Nestorio, nota congrui nominis ejus inuratur Gregalibus, ne Christianorum appellatione abutantur; sed quemadmodum Ariani lege divæ memoriæ Constantini ob similitudinem impietatis Porfyriani à Porfyrio nuncupantur; sic ubique participes nefariæ sectæ Nestorii Simoniani vocentur. —See the same in the Acts of the General Council of Ephesus, part iii. c. 45. Con. tom. iii. p. 1209. [8] Con. Sardic. Ep. Synod. ap. Theod. lib. ii. c. 8.

who as yet had never made any solemn profession of their faith in baptism. They allowed the catechumens the name of Christians, because they were candidates of Heaven; but they judged heretics unworthy of that name, because they corrupted the common faith of Christians, and denied the Lord, by whose name they were called.

SECT. 5.—Penitents and Energumens ranked in the same Class with Catechumens.

4thly. We may observe, in the last place, that there were no Christians but what might be reduced to some one or other of the three fore-mentioned orders; for the penitents and energumens, as they called those that were possessed with evil spirits, may be ranked among the catechumens, being commonly treated and disciplined by the Church in the same manner as they were, and placed in the same class with them; and the monks and other ascetics may be ranked under the common head of believers, though they had some peculiar marks of distinction in the Church. Yet I shall not confine myself to speak of all those precisely in this order, and under these heads, but give each a distinct and proper place in this discourse; speaking here only of believers in general, as they stood distinguished from the catechumens and the clergy of the Church, and treating of the rest as occasion shall require in the following parts of this discourse.

CHAP. IV.

A more particular Account of the Πιστοὶ, *or Believers; their Titles of Honour and Privileges above the Catechumens.*

SECT. 1.—Believers otherwise called Φωτιζόμενοι, The *Illuminate.*

THE Πιστοὶ, or *Fideles*, being such as were baptized, and thereby made complete and perfect Christians, were, upon that account, dignified with several titles of honour and marks of distinction above the catechumens: they were hence called φωτιζόμενοι, *the illuminate;* so the council of Laodicea[1] terms those that were newly baptized, προσφάτως

[1] Con. Laodic. Can. iii.

φωτισθέντας; and Jobius,[1] in Photius, οἱ φωτιζόμενοι; as St. Paul, himself, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, twice uses the word *illuminate* for baptized, in the opinion of most[2] interpreters. The reason of the name is given by Justin Martyr, who says,[3] they were so called because their understandings were enlightened by the knowledge that was consequent to baptism; for all the mysteries of religion were unveiled to the baptized, which were kept secret from the catechumens; and sometimes, also, baptism was attended with extraordinary illuminations of the Holy Ghost, as in those whom St. Paul caused to be baptized at Ephesus, Act. xix. 6. "They spake with tongues and prophesied."

SECT. 2.—And Οἱ Μεμυημένοι, *The Initiated.*

2. They were hence also styled, οἱ μεμυημένοι, which the Latins call *Initiati, the Initiated*, that is, admitted to the use of the sacred offices, and knowledge of the sacred mysteries of the Christian religion. Hence came that form of speaking, so frequently used by St. Chrysostom and other ancient writers,[4] when they touched upon any doctrines or mysteries which the catechumens understood not, ἴσασιν οἱ μεμυημένοι, *the initiated know what is spoken.* St. Ambrose writes a book to these *initiati.*[5] Isidore,[6] of Pelusium, and Hesychius,[7] call them μυτὰι, and others, μυταγώγητοι; whence the catechumens have the contrary names, Ἄμυτοι, Ἀμύητοι, and Ἀμυταγώγητοι, *the uninitiated* or *unbaptized.*

SECT. 3.—And Τέλειοι, *The Perfect.*

3. Believers were otherwise called τέλειοι, and τελειούμενοι, *the perfect*, because they were consummate Christians, who had a right to participate of the holy eucharist, the τὸ τέλειον, as it is frequently called in the canons[8] of the ancient councils, where ἐπι τὸ τέλειον ἐλθεῖν, and τοῦ τελεις

---

[1] Phot. Cod. ccxxii. p. 595 et 598. [2] See Grot. Hamond. Estius in Heb. 6. 4. and 10. 32. [3] Justin. Apol. ii. p. 94. [4] Casaubon Exerc. xvi. in Baron. p. 399. observes this phrase to occur no less than fifty times in St. Chrysostom and St. Austin. [5] Ambros. De his qui initiantur Mysteriis. [6] Isidor. lib. iv. Ep. 162. ἴσασιν οἱ μυτὰι τὸ λεγόμενον. [7] Hesych. Voce μυτὰι. [8] Con. Ancyran. Can. 4, 5, 6, &c.

μετέχειν, always signify participation of the holy eucharist, that sacred mystery that unites us to Christ, and gives us the most consummate perfection that we are capable of in this world.

SECT. 4.—Chari Dei, Filii Dei, Ἅγιοι, &c.

4. Tertullian adds to these the name of *Chari Dei,—the Favourites of Heaven*, because their prayers and intercessions were powerful with God to obtain pardon for others, that should address heaven by them. Therefore, in his instructions to the penitents, he bids them, "*Charis Dei adgeniculari,—fall down at the feet of those favourites*, and commend their suit to all the brethren, desiring them to intercede with God for them." *Tertul. de Pœnit.* c. 9.

All these names (and many others that might be added, which are obvious to every reader, such as Saints, and Sons of God, &c.) were peculiar titles of honour and respect, given only to those who were Πιστοὶ, or *Believers*.

SECT. 5.—The Privileges of the *Fideles*. 1. To partake of the Eucharist.

And hence it was, that, correspondent to these names, the *Fideles* had their peculiar privileges in the Church, above the catechumens. For, first, it was their sole prerogative to partake of the Lord's table, and communicate with one another in the symbols of Christ's body and blood at the altar. Hither none came but such as were first initiated by baptism: whence the custom was, before they went to celebrate the eucharist, for a deacon to proclaim, "Ἅγια Ἁγίοις, *Holy things for holy men*. "Ye catechumens go forth,[1]" as the author of the constitutions, and St. Chrysostom, and some others word it.

SECT. 6.—2. To join in all the Prayers of the Church.

2. Another of their prerogatives above catechumens, was, to stay and join with the minister in all the prayers of the Church, which the catechumens were not allowed to do; for in the ancient service of the Church, there were no

[1] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 8 and 12. Chrysost. Hom. in Parab. de Filio Prodig. tom. 6. μή τις τῶν κατηχουμένων, &c.

prayers preceding the communion-office; but only such as particularly related either to the several classes of penitents or the *energumeni*, that is, persons possessed with evil spirits, or the catechumens themselves. When these prayers were ended, the catechumens, and all others, were commanded to withdraw, and then began the communion-service at the altar, where none were admitted so much as to be spectators, save those who were to communicate in the eucharist; for to join in prayers and participation of the eucharist, were then privileges of the same persons; and no one was qualified for the prayers of the Church, who was not qualified for the communion.

SECT. 7.—3. The Use of the Lord's Prayer, another Prerogative of the Πιστοὶ; whence it was called Ἐυχὴ Πιστῶν, *The Prayer of Believers.*

3. More particularly the use of the Lord's prayer was the sole prerogative of the Πιστοὶ, or *believers;* for then it was no crime, or argument of weakness, or want of the spirit, to use it; but an honour and privilege of the most consummate and perfect Christians. The catechumens were not allowed to say, "Our Father," till they had first made themselves sons by regeneration in the waters of of baptism. This is expressly said by St. Chrysostom,[1] St. Austin,[2] Theodoret,[3] and several others; and for this reason, Chrysostom[4] calls it Ευχὴ Πιστῶν; and St. Austin,[5] *Oratio Fidelium,—the prayer of the regenerate, or believers;* because it was their privilege and birth-right. "It was given to them as their property," he[6] says, "and therefore they made use of it, having a right to say, 'Our Father, which art in heaven,' who were born again to such a Father, by water and the Holy Ghost."

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. ii. in 2 Cor. p. 740. [2] Aug. Hom. 29. de Verb. Apost. [3] Theodor. Epit. Div. Dogm. c. xxiv. [4] Chrysost. Hom. x. in Coloss. p. 1385. [5] Aug. Enchirid. c. 71. [6] Aug. Com. in Psal. 142. Orabant utique jam Fideles, jam Apostoli. Nam ista Oratio Dominica magis Fidelibus datur.

Id. Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 71. De Quotidianis, brevibus, levibusque peccatis - - - - quotidiana Oratio Fidelium satisfacit. Eorum est enim dicere, "Pater noster qui es in Cœlis;" qui jam Patri tali regenerati sunt, ex aquâ et Spiritu Sancto.

SECT. 8.—4. They were admitted to hear Discourses upon the most profound Mysteries of Religion.

4. Lastly, They were admitted to be auditors of all discourses made in the church, even those that treated of the most abstruse points and profound mysteries of the Christian religion; which the catechumens were strictly prohibited from hearing. The catechumens were allowed to hear the Scriptures, and the ordinary popular discourses that were made upon them; which was no more than what some councils[1] allow even to Jews and Gentiles: for in those discourses they never treated plainly of their mysteries, but in such a covert way as the catechumens could not understand them. But when the catechumens were dismissed, then they discoursed more openly of their mysteries before the *Fideles*, whose privilege it was to be the sole auditors of such discourses. This we learn from St. Ambrose,[2] who says, his common discourses to the unbaptized were only upon points of morality; but when they were baptized, then was the time to open to them the mysteries and sacraments of religion: to have discoursed to them of those things before, had been more like exposing mysteries than explaining them. St. Austin speaks to the same purpose in one of his sermons[3] to the newly-baptized: "Having now dismissed the catechumens," says he, "we have retained you only to be our hearers; because, beside those things which belong to all Christians in common, we are now to discourse more particularly of the heavenly mysteries, or sacraments; which none are qualified to hear

---

[1] Con. Carthag. iv. can. 14. Ut Episcopus nullum prohibeat ingredi Ecclesiam et audire Verbum Dei, sive Gentilem, sive Hæreticum, sive Judæum, usque ad Missam Catechumenorum. [2] Ambros. de his qui Mysteriis initiantur, c. 1. De Moralibus quotidianum Sermonem habuimus. - - - - Nunc de Mysteriis dicere tempus admonet, atque ipsam Sacramentorum rationem edere, quam ante baptismum si putassemus insinuandam nondum initiatis, prodidisse potius quàm edidisse æstimaremur. [3] Aug. Serm. 1. ad Neophytos in Append. T. x. p. 845. Dimissis jam Catechumenis, vos tantùm ad audiendum retinuimus: Quia præter illa, quæ omnes Christianos convenit in commune servare, specialiter de cœlestibus Mysteriis locuturi sumus, quæ audire non possunt, nisi qui ea, donante jam Domino, perceperunt. Tanto ergo majore reverentiâ debetis audire quæ dicimus, quanto majora ista sunt, quæ solis baptizatis et fidelibus auditoribus committuntur; quàm illa quæ etiam Catechumeni audire consueverunt.

but such as, by God's gift, are made partakers of them. And, therefore, ye ought to hear them with the greater reverence, by how much more sublime those doctrines are which are committed only to the baptized and believing auditors, than those which the catechumens also are wont to hear." Theodoret[1] takes notice of the same distinction made in their discourses, according to the difference of their auditors; saying, "We discourse obscurely of divine mysteries before the unbaptized; but when they are departed, we speak plainly to the baptized;" from all which it is evident, that the *Fideles* were singled out as the only proper auditors fit to hear discourses upon the sublime doctrines and mysteries of religion; and in these, and the like privileges, consisted their prerogative above the catechumens.

CHAP. V.

Of the Distinction betwixt the Laity and Clergy, and of the Antiquity of that Distinction.

SECT. I.—The *Fideles*, otherwise called *Laici*, to distinguish them from the Clergy.

WE have hitherto considered the great body of the Christian Church, the *Fideles*, as opposed to the catechumens. We are now to view them in another relation, as contradistinct to the clergy; in which relation they went by other names, such as those of *Laici*, *laymen*; Βιωτικοὶ, *seculars*; Ἰδιῶται, *private men*. The most common and ancient name was that of *Laici*, which every where occurs in the writings of Origen, Cyprian, and Tertullian, and others of the third century; which is a thing so evident, that the greatest enemies of this distinction, Rigaltius,[2] Salmasius, and Selden, do not pretend to dispute it; but only say, there was originally no such distinction in the Church; but that it is a novelty, and owing to the ambition of the clergy of the third century, in which Cyprian and Tertullian lived.

---

[1] Theod. Quæst. 15. in Num. [2] Rigalt. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 3.

SECT. 2.—The Antiquity of this Distinction proved against Rigaltius, Salmasius, and Selden.

This accusation reflects highly upon St. Cyprian, and other holy martyrs, his cotemporaries, who were as far from the ambition that is charged upon them, as the authors are from truth, who bring the charge. For, indeed, the distinction was none of their inventing; but derived from the Jewish Church, and adopted into the Christian by the Apostles themselves. Clemens Alexandrinus[1] speaking of St. John, says, "that after his return from banishment in the isle of Patmos, he settled at Ephesus; whence being often invited to visit the neighbouring regions, he ordained them bishops and set apart such men for the clergy, as were signified to him by the Holy Ghost." Whence it appears, that the name Κλῆρος, *Clergy*, was always a peculiar title of those that were set apart for the ministry and service of God. And that this distinction came from the Jewish Church, is evident from what Clemens Romanus[2] says of the Jewish œconomy; that as the high priest had his office assigned him, and the priests also their proper station, and the Levites their peculiar service; so laymen, in like manner, were under the obligation of precepts proper for laymen. These instances evidently prove, that a distinction was always observed in these names, Laity and Clergy, from the first foundation of the Christian Church.

SECT. 3.—An Objection from 1 Pet. v. iii. answered.

There is but one objection of any moment against this, which is taken from the words of St. Peter; where he bids the elders of the Church not lord it over God's heritage. The original is, μηδ' ὡς κατακυριευοντες τῶν κλήρων; which (as some learned[3] critics observe) may as well signify the possessions of the Church, as the people. But admit, that it means the people; this is no more than is said of the people of Israel, who are called God's κλῆρος, and λαὸς ἔγκληρος,

---

[1] Clem. Alexand. Quis Dives salvetur. ap. Combefis. Auctar. Noviss. p. 185. et ap. Euseb. lib. iii. c. 23. Κλήρῳ ἕνα γε τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ πνεύματος σημαινομένων. [2] Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. ad Corinth. n. 40. ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται. [3] Dodwel. Dissert. 1 in Cyprian.

his inheritance, or *his clergy;* Deut. iv. 20, ix. 29. As both the Jews and Christians were, in opposition to the heathen; notwithstanding which, God had his peculiar Κλῆρος among his own people, who were his lot or inheritance, and distinguished by that name from the *Laici*, or remaining body of the people. As we have observed before, in the name Πιστοὶ, *fideles*, or *believers;* all persons within the pale of the Church were called believers, in opposition to infidels and pagans; but when they would distinguish one order of men in the church from another, then the name, believers, was given peculiarly to such as were baptized, and the rest were called catechumens; so here, all Christian people are God's Κλῆρος, *his lot, his inheritance*, or *his clergy;* but when his ministers are to be distinguished from the rest of the people in the Church, then the name *Clerici*, or *Clergy*, was their appropriate title, and the name of the other laymen.

SECT. 4.—A Distinction in the Offices of Laity and Clergy always observed.

And this observation will help to set another sort of persons right, who confound not only the names, but the offices of laity and clergy together; and plead that originally there was no distinction between them. The name of priesthood, indeed, is sometimes given in common to the whole body of Christian people, 1 Pet. ii. 9. Rev. i. 6., but so it was to the Jewish people, Exod. xix. 6. "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." Yet every one knows, that the offices of the priests and Levites, among the Jews, were very distinct from those of the common people, not by usurpation, but by God's appointment; and so it was among Christians, from the first foundation of the Church. Wherever any number of converts were made, as soon as they were capable of being formed into an organical Church, a bishop, or a presbyter, with a deacon, was ordained to minister to them, as Epiphanius[1] delivers from the ancient histories of the Church. The same may be observed in the fore-mentioned passage of Clemens Alexandrinus, where he says, St. John ordained bishops

[1] Epiphan. Hær. 75. Aerian. n. 5.

and other clergy, in the churches which he regulated, by the direction of the Holy Ghost. Hence it is, that Ignatius so frequently in all his epistles charges the people to do nothing without the bishops,[1] presbyters, and deacons. Tertullian[2] says, it was customary among heretics to confound the offices of clergy and laity together. They made one a bishop to-day, and another to-morrow; to-day a deacon, and to-morrow a reader; to-day a presbyter, and to-morrow a layman. For laymen among them performed the offices of the priest-hood; but this was not the custom of the Catholic Church. For, as St. Jerom[3] observes, they reckoned that to be no church, which had no priests. They were of no esteem with them, who were both laymen and bishops together. And by this we may judge how ingenuously they deal with St. Jerom and Tertullian, who allege their authorities to prove, that every Christian is as much a priest as another. St. Jerom, indeed, says,[4] there is a laical priest-hood; but then he explains himself to mean no more by that, than Christian baptism, whereby we are made kings and priests to God. And Tertullian[5] grants no other priesthood to laymen, save that they may baptize in case of absolute necessity, when none of the ecclesiastical order can be had; which was according to the principles and practice of the primitive Church; but does by no means confound the offices of laity and clergy together, unless any one can think cases ordinary and extraordinary all one. The ancient historians,[6] Socrates and Ruffin, tell us, that Frumentius and Ædesius, two young men, who had no external call or commission to preach the Gospel, being carried captive

---

[1] Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 6. et 7. Ep. ad. Trall. n. 2. Ep. ad Philad. n. 7.
[2] Tertul. de Præscript. c. 41. Alius hodie Episcopus, cras alius: Hodie Diaconus, qui cras Lector: Hodie Presbyter, qui cras Laicus. Nam et Laicis sacerdotalia munera injungunt.
[3] Hieron. Dial. c. Lucifer. t. ii. p. 145. Ecclesia non est, quæ non habet Sacerdotes. Ibid. Omissis paucis homunculis, qui ipsi sibi et Laici sunt et Episcopi.
[4] Hieron. ibid. p. 136. Sacerdotium Laici, id est, Baptisma. Scriptum est enim, Regnum et Sacerdotes nos fecit, &c.
[5] Tertul. Exhort. ad Cast. c. 7. Nonne et Laici Sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est, Regnum quoque nos et Sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo fecit. ——— Ubi Ecclesiastici Ordinis est Consessus, et offert et tinguit Sacerdos, qui est ibi, solus. Sed ubi tres, Ecclesia est; licet Laici.
[6] Ruffin. lib. i. c. 9. Socrat. lib. i. c. 19.

into India, converted the nation, and settled several churches among them. And the same Socrates[1] and Theodoret say, that the Iberians were first converted by a captive woman, who made the king and queen of the nation preachers of the Gospel to their people. Yet a man would argue very weakly, that should hence conclude, that therefore there was no distinction betwixt clergy and laity in the primitive Church; or that laymen might preach without a call, and women ordain ministers of the Gospel. The author of the comments upon St. Paul's epistles, under the name[2] of St. Ambrose, seems to say indeed, that at first all Christ's disciples were clergy, and had all a general commission to preach the Gospel and baptize; but that was in order to convert the world, and before any multitude of people were gathered, or churches founded, wherein to make a distinction. But as soon as the Church began to spread itself over the world, and sufficient numbers were converted to form themselves into a regular society, then rulers and other ecclesiastical officers were appointed among them, and a distinction made, that no one,—no, not of the clergy themselves,—might presume to meddle with any office not committed to him, and to which he knew himself not ordained. So that, for ought that appears to the contrary, we may conclude, that the names and offices of laymen and clergy were always distinct from one another, from the first foundation of Christian Churches.

SECT. 5.—Laymen also called Βιωτικοὶ, *Seculars*.

The laymen were distinguished also by the name of Βιωτικοὶ, *seculars*, from Βίος, which signifies a *secular life*; and by this title they are discerned, not only from the clergy, but also from the ascetics, and those of a more retired life, who bid adieu to the world, and disburdened

---

[1] Socrat. lib. i. c. 20. Ἀμφότεροι κήρυκες τοῦ Χριστοῦ, &c. Theodor. lib. i. c. 23. [2] Ambros. sive Hilar. Diacon. Com. in Eph. iv. p. 248. Ut crescere Plebs et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est et evangelizare, et baptizare, et Scripturas in Ecclesiâ explanare. At ubi autem omnia loca circumplexa est Ecclesia, Conventicula constituta sunt, et Rectores, et cætera Officia in Ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de Clero auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere Officium, quod sciret non sibi creditum.

themselves of all secular cares and business. Thus, St. Chrysostom,[1] exhorting all men to read the Scriptures, says, "Let no man think to excuse himself by saying, I am a secular, ἀνὴρ βιωτικὸς, it belongs not to me to read the Scriptures, but to those that have retired from the world, and have taken up their abode in the tops of the mountains." And, in another place, commenting on those words of St. Paul, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers;" he says, "this command is given to the clergy, and to the monks, and not to the seculars[2] only;" and so they are styled in the author[3] who goes under the name of Justin Martyr and others.

SECT. 6.—And Ἰδιῶται, *Private Men.*

In some writers they are termed ἰδιῶται, *private men*, as being only in a private capacity, and not acting as public ministers. So it was another name to distinguish them from the clergy who were in the public office and employment of the Church. St. Chrysostom[4] and Theodoret[5] say, the word ἰδιώτης is so used by St. Paul himself, 1 Cor. xiv. 16, which we translate, *unlearned;* but they say it signifies no more than a layman, or one in a private capacity, whether learned or unlearned, who is not a public minister of the Church; and so Origen also uses the name ἰδιῶται, not for persons unlearned, but for laymen, who had power as well as other Christians to cast out devils in the name of Christ;[6] and Synesius opposes the names ἰδιῶται, and ἱερεῖς, to one another,[7] making the one to denote those who ministered in the sacred service of the Church; and the other, those who had no such office, but served God only in a private capacity, as laymen. Whence also, speaking of some clergymen who deserved to be degraded, he says,[8] they were to be treated publicly by all, ὡς ἄντικρυς ἰδιῶται, *as mere private men*, that is, no longer as clergymen, but laymen. Whence we may collect, that this was a common name for all such as had no public office or ministry in the Church.

---

[1] Chrys. Hom. 3. in Laz. t. v. [2] Chrys. Hom. 23. in Rom. ταῦτα διατάττεται ἱερεῦσι, ἢ μοναχοῖς, οὐχὶ τοῖς βιωτικοῖς μόνον. [3] Just. M. Resp. ad Quest. 19. τῷ βιωτικῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, &c. [4] Chrys. Hom. 35. in 1 Cor. xiv. ἰδιώτην δὲ λαϊκὸν λέγει. [5] Theod. Com. in 1 Cor. xiv. 16. ἰδιώτην καλεῖ τὸν ἐν τῷ λαϊκῷ τάγματι τεταγμένον. [6] Orig. c. Cels. lib. vii. p. 334. [7] Synes. Ep. liv. ad Theoph. p. 144. [8] Synes. Ep. lxvii. p. 259.

SECT. 7.—What Persons properly called *Clerici*.

On the other hand, all persons who had any public employment in the Church, were called by the common name of *Clerici;* which name at first was given only to the three superior orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, because there were then no other orders in the Church. But in the third century many inferior orders were appointed, as subservient to the deacon's office, such as sub-deacons, acolythists, readers, &c.; and then those also had the common name of *Clerici* too, having no further concern with secular affairs, but wholly attending the service of the Church. St. Cyprian always gives these the name of *Clerici;*[1] as where he speaks of Optatus, a sub-deacon, and Saturus, a reader; he styles them both *Clerici*. The ordinations of such he[2] calls *Ordinationes Clericæ;* and hence the letters which he had occasion to send to foreign parts by their hands, had the name of *Literæ*[3] *Clericæ*. Lucian, the martyr, and Cyprian's cotemporary, speaks in the same style concerning exorcists[4] and readers.

The council of Nice itself[5] gives the appellation of κλῆρος to others besides bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and the third council of Carthage made a canon[6] on purpose to confirm the title to them.

SECT. 8.—The name *Clerici* sometimes appropriate to the Inferior Orders.

Yea, the same council[7] seems rather to appropriate the name *Clerici* to the inferior orders, by way of distinction from the superior, first naming bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and then the *Clerici*, or *clerks;* that is, the inferior orders. And the same is done by St. Ambrose,[8] and Hilary[9]

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. 24. al. 29. ed. Ox. Quoniam oportuit me per Clericos scribere, &c. fecisse me sciatis Lectorem Saturum, et Hypodiaconum Optatum. [2] Id. Ep. xxxiii. al. 38. [3] See Fell. Not. in Cypr. Ep. xxiii. [4] Lucian. Ep. xvii. al. 23. ap. Cypr. Præsente de Clero, et Exorcista, et Lectore, Lucianus scripsit. [5] Con. Nic. Can. 3. [6] Con. Carth. iii. can. 21. Clericorum nomen etiam Lectores et Psalmistæ et Ostiarii retineant. [7] Con. Carth. iii. c. 15. Placuit ut Episcopi, et Presbyteri, et Diaconi, vel Clerici non sint Conductores. [8] Ambr. de Dignit. Sacerd. c. iii. Aliud est quod ab Episcopo requirit Deus, aliud quod à Presbytero, et aliud quod à Diacono, et aliud quod à Clerico, et aliud quod à Laico. [9] Pseud—Ambr. in Eph. iv. Nunc neque Diaconi in Populo prædicant, neque Clerici, vel Laici baptizant.

under his name, more expressly, who speak of the *Clerici* as distinct from the deacons. As also Epiphanius,[1] who, speaking of those that lapsed in Egypt in the Diocletian persecution, says, "some of them were soldiers, some clerks of divers orders, some presbyters, and some deacons." Where the *Clerici* are spoken of as distinct from presbyters and deacons; and so, in the council of Laodicea,[2] and many other places.

SECT. 9.—The Reason of the Name *Clerici*.

As to the reason of the name *Clerici* and *Clerus*, St. Jerom[3] rightly observes, that it comes from the Greek Κλῆρος, which signifies *a lot*; and thence he says, "God's Ministers were called *Clerici*, either because they are the lot and portion of the Lord, or because the Lord is their lot, that is, their inheritance." Others[4] think some regard was had to the ancient custom of choosing persons into sacred offices by lot, both among Jews and Gentiles; which is not improbable, though that custom never generally prevailed among Christians, as shall be shewed hereafter.

SECT. 10.—All the Clergy called *Canonici*.

There is another name for the clergy, very commonly to be met with in the ancient councils, which is that of *Canonici*, a name derived from the Greek word Κανὼν, which signifies among other things, the roll or catalogue of every Church, wherein the names of all the ecclesiastics were written, and which was, as it were, the rule of knowing to what Church they belonged. In this sense the word Κανὼν is often used by the council[5] of Nice. The council of Antioch[6] calls it ἅγιος κανὼν, *the sacred roll*; the apostolical canons, κατάλογος ἱερατικὸς,[7] *the catalogue of the clergy*; which is the same that Sidonius Apollinaris[8] calls *Albus*; and the council of Agde,[9] by the name of *Matricula*; and St. Austin,[10] *Tabula Clericorum*.

---

[1] Epiphan. Hær. 68. Melet. [2] Con. Laodic. can. xx. [3] Hieron. Ep. li. ad. Nepot. Cleros græcè, Sors latinè appellatur: propterea vocantur Clerici, vel quia de Sorte sunt Domini, vel quia ipse Dominus Sors, id est, Pars Clericorum est. [4] Dodwel. Dissert. i. in Cypr. s. 15. [5] Con. Nic. Can. 16. 17. 19. [6] Con. Antioch. c. 1. [7] Can. Apostol. c. 13. 14. 15. 50. &c. [8] Sidon. lib. vi. Ep. 8. Nomen Lectorum Albus nuper excepit. [9] Con. Agathens. can. 2. Rescripti in Matriculâ gradum suum dignitatemque suscipiant. [10] Aug. Hom. 50. de Diversis. t. x. p. 523. Delebo eum de Tabulâ Clericorum.

Now because the names of all the clergy were enrolled in this catalogue or canon, they were hence called *Canonici.* As in St. Cyril[1] κανονικῶν παρουσία signifies *the presence of the clergy;* and κανονικοὶ ψαλταὶ in the council of Laodicea,[2] signifies such of the clergy as were ordered to sing in the Church. And so generally in the councils of Nice[3] and Antioch, οἱ ἐν τῷ κανόνι, is put to denote the clergy of the Church. And upon the same account all others, whose names were set down in the Church's books, to entitle them to receive maintenance from the Church, were called by the same name, *Canonici,* such as the monks, virgins, widows, &c. whom St. Basil[4] speaks of under this name, as Balsamon and Zonaras understand him.

SECT. II.—And Τάξις τοῦ Βήματος, *the Order of the Sanctuary.*

I pass over many other names of the clergy, which are obvious to every reader: such as that of Ecclesiastics, and ἱερατικοὶ, or, τάξις ἱερατικὴ, *the holy order,* &c. and shall but take notice of one more, which rarely occurs any where but in Gregory Nazianzen, who gives the clergy, especially the superior clergy, the name of Τάξις τοῦ Βήματος, *the order of the sanctuary.*[5] Which name was given them from their privilege of entering into that part of the Church, where the altar stood, which (as we shall see when we come to speak of Churches) was called Βῆμα or Ἱερατεῖον, *the sanctuary.* Hither none might come but the clergy, who were therefore called the order of the sanctuary. Whence in the same author[6] τῷ βήματι προσάγειν, signifies *to give a man ordination, or make him a clergyman;* and ὁ ἀπὸ βήματος, is *one of the sacred order,*[7] or *one of the clergy.*

---

[1] Cyril. Præf. Catech. n. 3. [2] Con. Laodic. can. 15. [3] Con. Antioch. can. 2 et 6. Con. Nic. can. 16 et 17. [4] Basil. Ep. Canonic. c. 6. [5] Naz. Orat. 20. in Laud. Basil. p. 336. [6] Id. Orat. 19. de Fun. Patr. [7] Naz. Orat. xix. p. 310 et 311. Orat. xx. p. 351.

BOOK II.

OF THE SEVERAL ORDERS OF THE CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the Original of Bishops; and that they were a distinct Order from Presbyters in the Primitive Church.

SECT. 1.—What the Ancients mean by different Orders of Bishops and Presbyters.

WE have hitherto considered the clergy in general, as distinct from the laity, and come now to examine by what names or offices they were distinguished from one another. And here the most ancient distinction that occurs, is that of the superior clergy into the three distinct orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. That there were no other orders in the Church but these three at first, will be evidenced in its proper place, when I come to give an account of the first rise and original of the inferior orders; and, that deacons were always a sacred and standing order, will be proved likewise when I speak particularly of them. Here then it remains, that our inquiry be made only into the distinction betwixt the orders of bishops and presbyters; and this, so far as concerns matter of fact, and the practice of the Church, (which is the thing I have undertaken to give an account of,) will be most fairly and fully resolved, by considering only these three things. 1. That the ancient writers of the Church always speak of these as distinct orders. 2. That they derive the original of bishops from divine authority and apostolical constitution. 3. That they give us particular accounts and catalogues of such bishops as were first settled and consecrated, in the new-founded Churches, by the hands of the Apostles.

But before I proceed to the proof of these things, I must premise one particular, to avoid all ambiguity; that I take the word *order* in that sense as the ancients use it, and not as many of the school-men do; who, for reasons of their own, distinguish between order and jurisdiction, and make bishops and presbyters to be one and the same order, only differing in power and jurisdiction. This distinction was unknown to the ancients; among whom, the words order, degree, office, power, and jurisdiction, when they speak of the superiority of bishops above presbyters, mean but one and the same thing, *viz.* the power of the supreme governors of the Church, conferred upon them in their ordination, over presbyters, who are to do nothing but in subordination to them. St. Jerom, who will be allowed to speak the sense of the ancients, makes no difference in these words, *ordo, gradus, officium;* but uses them promiscuously, to signify the power and jurisdiction of bishops above presbyters and the whole Church; which is, properly speaking, the very essence of their order. Therefore, sometimes he calls them different orders, as in his book against Jovinian,[1] where he says, "that both in the Old and New Testament, the high-priests are one order, the priests another, and the Levites another." So, in his epistles[2] to Rusticus, and Fabiola,[3] where he joins *ordo* and *gradus* together. In other places he uses the word *gradus* only; as, in his epistle to Eustochium,[4] he calls presbyters, priests of the inferior degree; and, in his epistle to Heliodore,[5] deacons the third degree; and, in his comment upon Micah,[6] bishops, priests, and deacons, the degrees in the Church. At other times he ex-

---

[1] Hieron. cont. Jovin. lib. ii. p. 89. In veteri Testamento, et in Novo, alium Ordinem Pontifex tenet, alium Sacerdotes, alium Levitæ. [2] Id. Ep. ad Rustic. t. i. p. 46. Singuli Ecclesiarum Episcopi, singuli Archipresbyteri, singuli Archidiaconi, et omnis Ordo Ecclesiasticus suis Rectoribus nititur. [3] Id. ad Fabiol. de 42. Mansion. Israel. t. iii. p. 44. Ipsos secundi Ordinis intelligimus Præceptores, Lucâ Evangelistâ testante, duodecim fuisse Apostolos, et septuaginta Discipulos minoris gradus. [4] Ep. 27. ad Eustoch. Aderant Hierosolymarum et aliarum urbium Episcopi, et Sacerdotum inferioris gradus, et Levitarum innumerabilis multitudo. [5] Ep. 1. ad Heliodor. Non minorem in tertio gradu adhibuit diligentiam, &c. [6] Com. in Mic. vii. p. 162. Non hoc dico, quod istius modi gradibus in Ecclesiâ nostra debeatis esse subjecti.

e intended to express the same thing, *viz.* the
of bishops over their presbyters and the whole
and in this sense I use the word order in this dis-
express the opinion of the ancients concerning
nt powers of bishops and presbyters in the

e Order of Bishops always owned to be superior to that of Presbyters.

at there was such a distinction always observed
rch, is evident; 1st, From the testimony of the
nt writers, who speak of bishops, presbyters, and
distinct degrees in the Church, and the two lat-
rdinate to the first. The testimonies of Ignatius,
pose,[3] are so full and evident, that nothing was
ded to be said against them, save only, that they
genuine remains of that ancient author; which
so often considered and replied to, by learned
there is no pretence left to favour such an ima-
The citations are too numerous to be here in-
arge, and therefore I shall only give the reader
in one single testimony, by which he may judge
rest. In his epistle to the Magnesians, he ex-
to do all things in unity, under the bishop pre-
e place of God; and the presbyters in the place
tolical senate; and the deacons, to whom is com-
ministry and service of Jesus Christ

The author of the acts of the martyrdom of Ignatius,[1] lately published from an ancient Greek copy, speaks exactly in the same manner of these three orders, when he says, "That, as Ignatius was on his journey to Rome, all the cities and churches of Asia sent to salute him by their bishops, presbyters, and deacons." Not long after these authors, lived Pius, bishop of Rome, whose authority I cite, because Blondel[2] allows it to be genuine. This author, in his epistle to Justus of Vienna, gives him the title of bishop,[3] and speaks of presbyters and deacons under him. In the beginning of the next age we have the testimonies of Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and Tertullian, all agreeing in the same thing, that there were then, in their own times, the different orders of bishops and presbyters in the Church. "There are here in the Church," says Clemens,[4] "the different degrees or progressions of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, in imitation of the angelical glory." Origen takes notice of this distinction above ten times[5] in his works, which those that please may read at large in Bishop Pearson. I shall only recite two passages, one out of his homilies upon St. Luke, written whilst he was a layman, where he says, "That[6] digamy excludes men from all ecclesiastical dignities; for one that is twice married, can neither be made bishop, presbyter, nor deacon." Here he calls them different dignities; in the other[7] place he calls them different degrees, saying, "Every one shall be punished according to his degree. If the supreme governor of the Church offends, he shall have the greater punishment. A layman will deserve mercy in comparison of a

---

[1] Martyr. Ignat. ap. Grabe Spicil. Sæcul. 2. t. i. p. 12. [2] Blondel. Apol. p. 18. [3] Pius. Ep. 2. ad Just. Vien. Tu verò apud Senatoriam Viennam——Colobio Episcoporum vestitus, &c. Presbyteri et Diaconi te observent. [4] Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vi. p. 667. Ἐνταῦθα κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν προκοπαὶ ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, &c. Id. Pædag. lib. iii. c. 12. p. 264. [5] Origen. Hom. 2. in Num. Hom. 2. in Cantic. Hom. 6. in Esai. Hom. 5, et 16. in Ezek. Con. in Mat. 19, et 21. De Orat. ap. Pearson Vindic. Ignat. part. i. c. 11. p. 320. [6] Orig. Hom. 17. in Luc. Ab Ecclesiasticis Dignitatibus non solum Fornicatio sed et Nuptiæ repellunt—Neque enim Episcopus, nec Presbyter, nec Diaconus, nec Vidua possunt esse Digami. [7] Orig. Hom. 5. in Ezek. Pro modo graduum unusquisque torquebitur, &c.

deacon, and a deacon in comparison of a presbyter." So that bishops, in his opinion, were then a degree above presbyters and deacons. Tertullian frequently[1] mentions the same distinction; but more especially in his book, *de Baptismo*, where he says,[2] "The right of baptizing belongs to the chief-priest, who is the bishop; and after him, to presbyters and deacons; yet not without the authority of the bishop, for the honour of the Church, in the preservation of which consists the Church's peace."

These allegations are sufficient evidences, as to matter of fact, and the practice of the Church in the three first ages, that there was then an order of chief-priests, or bishops, superior to presbyters, settled and allowed in the Christian Church.

SECT. 3.—The Order of Bishops, of Apostolical Institution.

If we proceed a little further into this inquiry, and examine from what original this appointment came, whether from ecclesiastical or apostolical institution, which is another question, concerning matter of fact, that will in some measure determine the right also. The same authors, with the unanimous consent of all others, declare, that it was no human invention, but an original settlement of the Apostles themselves, which they made by divine appointment. "The order of bishops," says Tertullian,[3] "when it is traced up to its original, will be found to have St. John for one of its authors." This agrees exactly with what Clemens Alexandrinus[4] has recorded of him, "That when he was settled at Ephesus, he went about the neighbouring regions, ordaining bishops, and setting apart such men for the clergy, as were signified to him by the Holy Ghost." These were those Asiatic bishops that St. Jerom[5] speaks of,

---

[1] Tertul. de Monogam. c. 11. De Fugâ. c. 11. De Præscript. c. 41.

[2] Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17. Dandi quidem jus habet summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus: Dehinc Presbyteri, et Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo, salva Pax est.

[3] Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib. iv. c. 5. Ordo Episcoporum ad originem recensus, in Joannem stabit auctorem.

[4] Clem. Alex. Quis dives salvetur. ap. Combefis. Auct. Novissim. p. 185. et ap. Euseb. lib. iii. c. 23.

[5] Hieron. Catal. Scriptor. Eccles. in Joanne. Novissimus omnium scripsit Evangelium, rogatus ab Asiæ Episcopis.

who says, "that, at their request, St. John wrote his gospel against the heresies of Ebion and Cerinthus." Whence it follows, that, according to this account, the order of bishops was settled before the canon of scripture was concluded. Whence Clemens of Alexandria[1] further observes, "That there are many precepts in Scripture appertaining to particular sorts of persons, some to presbyters, some to deacons, and some to bishops also." Irenæus declares himself of the same opinion, that there were bishops as well as presbyters in the Apostles' days; "for the assembly of Miletus," he says,[2] "was composed of bishops and presbyters, that were of Ephesus and the neighbouring cities of Asia." And therefore, agreeably to that hypothesis, he always derives the succession of bishops, and their original, from the apostles; as where he says,[3] "that Hyginus, bishop of Rome, was the ninth in order of episcopal succession from the Apostles.[4]" And, in another place,[5] giving an exact catalogue of the twelve bishops of Rome, that governed successively in that see to his own time, he says, of Linus, the first of them, that he was ordained bishop immediately, by the Apostles, upon the first foundation of the Church; and of Eleutherius, the last of them, that he was the twelfth bishop from the Apostles. Tertullian[6] insists much upon the same argument, and makes a challenge to all sorts of heretics upon it: "Let them shew us the ori-

---

[1] Clem. Alex. Pædag. lib. iii. c. 12. p. 264. [2] Iren. lib. iii. c. 14. In Mileto convocatis Episcopis et Presbyteris, qui erant ab Epheso et à reliquis proximis Civitatibus. [3] Id. lib. i. c. 28. Hyginus nonum locum Episcopatûs per successionem ab Apostolis habuit. [4] Euseb. lib. iv. c. 11, cites the same out of Irenæus. [5] Iren. lib. iii. c. 3. Fundantes et instruentes beati Apostoli Ecclesiam, Lino Episcopatum administrandæ Ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Cited also by Euseb. lib. v. c. 6. [6] Tertul de Præscript. c. 32. Edant Origines Ecclesiarum suarum: evolvant ordinem Episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverint, habuerit Auctorem et Antecessorem. Hoc enim modo Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ census suos deferunt: Sicut Smyrnæorum Ecclesia Polycarpum ab Joanne conlocatum refert: Sicut Romanorum Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit: Proinde utique et cæteræ exhibent, quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos, Apostolici seminis traduces habent. See also, c. 36. ibid. Polycrat. Epist. ap. Euseb. lib. v. c. 24. Cyprian. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian, p. 104. Cum Fabiani Locus, id est, Locus Petri, et gradus Cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret. Id. Ep. 27. al. 33. ed. Oxon.

ginal of their Churches, and give us a catalogue of their bishops, in an exact succession, from first to last, whereby it may appear, that their first bishop had either some Apostle, or some apostolical man, living in the time of the Apostles, for his author or immediate predecessor. For thus it is, that apostolical Churches make their reckoning:—the Church of Smyrna counts up to Polycarp, ordained by St. John; the Church of Rome to Clemens, ordained by St. Peter; and so all other Churches, in like manner, exhibit their first bishops ordained by the Apostles, by whom the apostolical seed was propagated and conveyed to others." This implies, that the Apostles, as they founded Churches, settled bishops in them; and that this might be proved from the records and archives of every Church (the most of which were probably then remaining) when Tertullian made this challenge to all heretics, and appealed to these original records in behalf of the Catholic Church.

Sect. 4.—A List or Catalogue of such Bishops as were first ordained by the Apostles.

An exact and authentic catalogue of these first foundations, would be a very useful and entertaining thing; but, at this distance of time, it is impossible to gratify the world with any such curiosity, whatever pains should be taken about it. Yet there are some scattered remains and fragments to be collected out of the ancient writers, which will sufficiently answer our present design; which is to evidence, that the Apostles settled bishops in all Churches, upon their first plantation.

To begin with the Church of Rome;—we have already heard Irenæus and Tertullian declaring, that the Apostles ordained a bishop there. And the same is asserted by St. Chrysostom,[1] and Eusebius,[2] and Ruffin,[3] and St. Jerom,[4] and Optatus,[5] and Epiphanius,[6] and St. Austin, who says,[7]

---

[1] Chrys. Hom. 10. in 2. Tim. [2] Euseb. lib. iii. c. 4. [3] Ruffin ap. Hieron. Apol. ii. p. 219. [4] Hieron. Catal. Script. in Clemen. [5] Optat. lib. ii. p. 48. [6] Epiph. Hær. 27. [7] Aug. Ep. 165. Si Ordo Episcoporum sibi succedentium considerandus est; quanto certius et verè salubriter ab ipso Petro numeramus? - - - - Petro enim successit Linus, Lino Clemens, Clementi Anacletus, &c.

"If the order of bishops succeeding one another be of any consideration, we take the surest and soundest way, who begin to number from St. Peter; for Linus succeeded Peter; and Clemens, Linus; and Anacletus, Clemens," &c.

It is true there is a little difference in the account which these authors give of the succession; for some reckon Linus first, then Anacletus, then Clemens. Others begin with Clemens, and reckon him the first in order from St. Peter. But this is easily reconciled by learned men,[1] who make it appear, that Linus and Anacletus died whilst St. Peter lived; and that Clemens was ordained their successor by St. Peter also. So that we have two or three persons, by this account, ordained successively bishops of Rome, by the hands of the Apostles.

Next, for the Church of Jerusalem;—it is unanimously delivered by all ancient writers, that James, the Lord's brother, was the first bishop thereof. St. Jerom[2] says, "He was ordained by the Apostles, immediately after our Lord's crucifixion." Epiphanius[3] calls him, therefore, the first bishop; the first who had an episcopal chair; the first to whom Christ committed his own throne upon earth. Chrysostom[4] says, "He was made bishop by Christ himself." The author[5] of the Apostolical Constitutions, "Both by Christ and the Apostles." In like manner, Eusebius[6] always speaks of him under that character, as first bishop of Jerusalem, ordained by the Apostles. So Hegesippus,[7] Clemens Alexandrinus,[8] and Dionysius,[9] bishop of Corinth, all cited by Eusebius; to whom we may add St Austin,[10]

---

[1] Cotel. Not. in Const. Apost. lib. vii. c. 46. Pearson de Success. Rom. Pontif. Dissert. ii. c. 2. Cave Hist. Lit. vol. i. in Clem. [2] Hieron. Catal. Script. c. 3. Post Passionem Domini, statim ab Apostolis Hierosolymorum Episcopus ordinatus. Id. Com. in Gal. i. p. 165. Hic Jacobus primus Hierosolymorum Episcopus fuit. [3] Epiphan. Hær. 78. Antidicomar. n. 7. Id. Hær. 29. Nazor. n. 3. Hær. 66. Manich. n. 19.
[4] Chrys. Hom. 38. in 1 Cor. 15. [5] Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 35.
[6] Euseb. lib. ii. c. 23. lib. iii. c. 5, et 7. lib. vii. c. 19. [7] Hegesip. ap. Euseb. lib. 2. c. 23. [8] Clem. Hypotypos. lib. vi. ap. Euseb. lib. ii. c. 1.
[9] Dionys. Ep. ad Atheniens. ap. Euseb. lib. iv. c. 23. [10] Aug. contra Crescon. lib. ii. c. 37. Hierosolymitanam Ecclesiam primus Apostolus Jacobus Episcopatu suo rexit. Id. cont. Liter. Petil. lib. ii. c. 51. Cathedra Ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ, in quâ Jacobus sedit, et in quâ hodie Joannes sedet. See also Cyril. Catechism. iv. n. 17, Catech. xiv. n. 13.

who styles John, bishop of Jerusalem, St. James's successor, and possessor of the chair, wherein he sat as first bishop of the place. And it is remarkable what Clemens, one of the most ancient of these writers, says, "That this was designed as a peculiar honour to St. James, in regard that he was the brother of Christ; for though our Saviour usually gave the preference to Peter, and John, and James, his brother, yet none of those contended about this honour, but chose this James, sirnamed Justus, to be bishop of the place; where he lived a saint, and died a martyr."

Some time after his death, as Eusebius[1] relates from ancient tradition, the apostles and disciples of our Lord, as many as were yet in being, met together with our Saviour's kinsmen, several of which were then alive, to consult about choosing a successor in St. James's room; and they unanimously agreed upon Simeon, son of Cleopas, our Saviour's cousin according to the flesh, thinking him the most fit and worthy person to sit upon the episcopal throne. The same is asserted by Eusebius in other[2] places, and the author[3] of the Constitutions, under the name of Clemens Romanus.

From Jerusalem, if we pass to Antioch, there again we find Euodius first, and after him Ignatius, ordained bishops by the hands of the Apostles. Baronius[4] and some others fancy, that they sat both at the same time; the one, as bishop of the Jews, and the other, of the Gentiles. But Eusebius[5] says expressly, that Euodius was the first, and Ignatius the second, after Euodius was dead. And it is agreed by all ancient writers, that they were both consecrated before St. Peter's death. Of Euodius there can be no question made, if it appears that Ignatius was ordained by the Apostles in his room. Now this is most expressly said by Thodoret,[6] "That he received the gift of the high-priesthood, ἀρχιερωσύνης χάριν, from the hand of the great Peter." In like manner, Chrysostom, in his encomium[7] upon him, says, "He does not only admire him because

[1] Euseb. lib. iii. c. 11. [2] Idem Chronic. [3] Constit. Apost. lib. vii. c. 46. [4] Baron. an. 45. n. 14. an. 71. n. 11. Halloix Vit. Ignat. c. 2. p. 204. [5] Euseb. lib. iii. c. 22. [6] Theod. Dial. 1. t. v. p. 33. [7] Chrysost. Hom. 42. in Ignat. tom. i. p. 563. Ed. Front. Duc.

he was thought worthy of so high a degree, but that he was ordained to it by those holy men, and had the hands of the blessed Apostles laid upon his sacred head." The same is said in effect by Athanasius,[1] when he calls him the first bishop of Antioch after the Apostles; and Origen,[2] who calls him the second after St. Peter; and Jerom,[3] the third; for though they count differently, yet they mean the same thing; that Ignatius was ordained successor to Euodius while the Apostles lived, and so might be called either second or third after the Apostles, according as St. Peter and Euodius were included, or excluded out of the number.

From Antioch let us go to Smyrna, where we shall find Polycarp, another apostolical bishop, ordained by the Apostles. St. Jerom ascribes his ordination[4] to St. John, whose disciple he was. Irenæus says, he himself knew him, and therefore could not mistake in what he relates of him; which is, that he was ordained bishop by the Apostles.[5] Tertullian[6] and Eusebius[7] witness the same; the one saying that he was ordained by St. John, and the other, by those that had seen the Lord.

Papias was another disciple of St. John,[8] as both Irenæus and St. Jerom witness; and he was cotemporary with Ignatius and Polycarp, and bishop of Hierapolis about the same time; that is, in the beginning of the second century. So that it is probable he was another of those bishops, whom St. John ordained in Asia, though we have no express testimony to prove it.

But it is asserted by all ancient writers, that Timothy was ordained bishop of Ephesus by St. Paul. Eusebius,[9] Chrysostom,[10] Epiphanius,[11] Jerom,[12] Hilary the deacon,[13] and the

---

[1] Athan. de Synod. Arim. t. i. p. 922. [2] Orig. Hom. 6. in Luc. Ignatium dico Episcopum Antiochiæ post Petrum secundum. [3] Hieron. Catal. Scriptor. in Ignat. Tertius post Petrum Apostolum Episcopus. [4] Hieron. Catal. Script. c. 17. Polycarpus Joannis Apostoli Discipulus, ab eo Smyrnæ Episcopus ordinatus. [5] Iren. lib. 3. c. 3. Ab Apostolis in Asiâ, in eâ quæ est Smyrnis Ecclesia, constitutus Episcopus, quem et nos vidimus in primâ nostrâ ætate. [6] Tertul. de Præscrip. c. 32. [7] Euseb. lib. iii. c. 36. et lib. iv. c. 14. [8] Iren. lib. v. c. 33. Papias Joannis Auditor, Polycarpi Contubernalis. Hieron. Ep. 29. ad Theodor. It. de Scriptor. [9] Euseb. lib. iii. c. 4. [10] Chrys. Hom. i. in Philip. [11] Epiph. Hær. 75. Aerian. [12] Hieron. Catal. Scriptor. in Timotheo. [13] Pseudo-Ambros. Præf. in Tim. It. Com. in i. Tim. 3.

f the passion of Timothy, in Photius,[1] unanimously
; and Theodoret[2] affirms moreover, "That he was
ınder the title of an Apostle."
ɔf the same authors agree in the same evidence for
that he was made bishop of Crete by St. Paul
d Chrysostom,[4] with Eusebius, seems to give both
. Timothy the power of metropolitans; of which
reafter.
ɜ say, that Dionysius, the Areopagite, was made
ıop of Athens. Eusebius[5] more than once men-
epistle of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, a very an-
iter of the second century, wherein this is expressly
. So that he must be ordained, either by St. Paul
as Suidas and others[6] think, or by some other
It is generally agreed, that this Dionysius died
me before St. John, and was succeeded in his
ɔ by Publius, and he by Quadratus, whom St.
alls a disciple of the Apostles; which, in all proba-
ıfers to his being tutored by St. John. Now, if
ıs himself was St. John's disciple, (as he might
was bishop in the time of the Emperor Hadrian, to
ɔ presented his apology,) then there might be three
successively at Athens, all trained up by the
, and two of them consecrated by their hands, or
vith their consent and approbation.
l end this catalogue of primitive bishops with what
et[8] says of Epaphroditus: "That, as Timothy and
ıre bishops of Ephesus and Crete under the name
les, so Epaphroditus was bishop of Philippi under
ɔ title," which was then the common name of all
re properly bishops; of which I say no more in
e, because I give a more particular account of it
llowing chapter.

---

od. 254. [2] Theodor. Com. in 1 Tim. iii. 1. [3] Euseb. et
e. cit. Hieron. de Scriptor. in Tito. Pseudo-Ambros. Præf. in Tit.
c. cit. [4] Chrys. Hom. 1. in Tit. It. Hom. 15 in 1 Tim. [5] Eu-
. c. 4. It. lib. iv. c. 23. [6] Suidas in Voce Dionys. Maxim. Prolog.
ionysii. [7] Hieron. de Scriptor. c. 19. Quadratus Apostolorum
Publio Athenarum Episcopo ob Christi fidem martyrio coronato, in
substituitur. [8] Theod. Com. in 1 Tim. iii. 1.

CHAP. II.

Of the several Titles of Honour given to Bishops in the Primitive Church.

Sect. 1.—All Bishops at first called Apostles.

For further confirmation of what has been asserted in the foregoing chapter, it will not be amiss here to subjoin next a short account of the several titles of honour, which were given to bishops in the primitive Church. The most ancient of these, is the title of Apostles; which, in a large and secondary sense, is thought by many to have been the original name for bishops, before the name, bishop, was appropriated to their order. For at first they suppose the names, bishop and presbyter, to have been common names for all of the first and second order; during which time, the appropriate name for bishops, to distinguish them from mere presbyters, was that of Apostles. Thus Theodoret[1] says expressly, "The same persons were anciently called promiscuously, both bishops and presbyters, whilst those, who are now called bishops, were called Apostles. But shortly after, the name of Apostles was appropriated to such only as were Apostles indeed; and then the name, bishop, was given to those, who before were called Apostles." Thus, he says, "Epaphroditus was the Apostle of the Philippians, and Titus the Apostle of the Cretians, and Timothy the Apostle of the Asiatics." And this he repeats[2] in several other places of his writings.

The author, under the name of St. Ambrose,[3] asserts the same thing; that all bishops were called Apostles at first. And therefore he says,[4] that St. Paul, to distinguish himself from such Apostles, calls himself an Apostle not of man, nor sent by man to preach, as those others were, who were chosen and sent by the Apostles to confirm the Churches. Amalarius[5] cites another passage out of the same author,

---

[1] Theodor. Com. in 1 Tim. 3. 1. [2] Theodor. Com. in Phil. i. 1. It. in Phil. ii. 25. [3] Ambros. Com. in Eph. iv. Apostoli Episcopi sunt. [4] Id. Com. ni Gal. i. 1. [5] Amalar. de Offic. Eccles. lib. ii. c. 13. Qui nunc Episcopi nominantur, illi tunc Apostoli dicebantur, &c.

which speaks more fully to the purpose; "they," says he, "who are now called bishops, were originally called Apostles; but the holy Apostles being dead, they, who were ordained after them to govern the Churches, could not arrive to the excellency of those first; nor had they the testimony of miracles, but were in many other respects inferior to them. Therefore they thought it not decent to assume to themselves the name of Apostles; but dividing the names, they left to presbyters the name of the presbytery, and they themselves, were called bishops."

This is what those authors infer from the identity of the names, bishop and presbyter, in the first age. They do not thence argue (as some who abuse their authority have done since) that therefore bishops and presbyters were all one; but they think that bishops were then distinguished by a more appropriate name, and more expressive of their superiority, which was that of secondary Apostles.

Sect. 2.—After that, Successors of the Apostles.

Afterwards bishops thought it honour enough to be styled the Apostles' successors. As Cyprian,[1] and Firmilian,[2] and the bishops in the council[3] of Carthage call themselves and others. And St. Jerom[4] speaks of them in the same style, saying, "Wheresoever a bishop is, whether at Rome, or Eugubium; at Constantinople, or at Rhegium; at Alexandria, or at Tanis; they are all of equal merit, their priesthood is the same; they are all successors to the Apostles." And both he and St. Austin,[5] draw that of thePsalmist to this sense; "Instead of thy fathers, thou shalt have children, whom thou mayest make princes in all lands." They say, bishops are the sons of the Apostles, and princes and fathers in the Church.

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. 69. al. 66. ad Florent. Qui Apostolis vicariâ ordinatione succedunt. Id. Ep. 42. al. 45. ad Cornel. Laborare debemus, ut unitatem à Domino, et per Apostolos nobis Successoribus traditam, obtinere curemus. [2] Firmil. Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. p. 225. [3] Con. Carthag. ap. Cypr. in Suffragio Clari à Mascula. [4] Hieron. Epist. 85. ad Evagr. It. in Psal. xliv. 16. [5] Aug. com. in Psal. xliv. 16. p. 169. Pro Apostolis nati sunt Filii tibi, constituti sunt Episcopi,——Ipsa Ecclesia Patres illos appellat.

SECT. 3.—Whence every Bishop's See, called *Sedes Apostolica*.

And hence it was anciently every bishop's see was dignified with the title of *Sedes Apostolica, an apostolical see;* which in those days was no peculiar title of the bishop of Rome, but given to all bishops in general, as deriving their original, and counting their succession from the Apostles. "The Catholic Church," says St. Austin,[1] "is propagated and diffused over all the world by the apostolical sees, and the succession of bishops in them." It is plain, this is not spoken only of the bishops of Rome, but all other bishops whatsoever. Sidonius Apollinaris[2] uses the same expression, in speaking of a private French bishop, who sat five and forty years, he says, in his apostolical see. And Paulinus[3] makes no more but the usual compliment to Alipius, when he tells him, "That God had deservedly placed him in an apostolical see with the princes of his people."

SECT. 4.—Bishops called Princes of the People.

Where we must also note, that Paulinus speaks in the usual phrase and style of those ancient times, when he calls bishops princes of the people. For that was another usual title that was given them; as appears from Optatus,[4] and several passages in St. Jerom,[5] who, to distinguish them from secular princes, usually styles them *Principes Ecclesiæ,*[6] *Princes of the Church;* applying to them that prophecy of Isaiah, lx. 17. which according to his translation is, "I will make thy princes peace, and thy bishops righteousness;" upon which he[7] has this note; "that the majesty of the Holy Scripture is to be admired, in that it

[1] Aug. Ep. 42. ad Fratres Madaurens. Christiana Societas per sedes Apostolorum et successiones Episcoporum certâ per orbem propagatione diffunditur. [2] Sidon. lib. vi. ep. 1. ad Lup. Tricassin. In apostolicâ sede novem jam decursa Quinquennia. [3] Paulin. Ep. 45. ad Alypium. Cum Principibus populi suî sede Apostolicâ meritò collocavit Dominus. See also Tertul. de Præscript. c. 36. Ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsidentur.——Habes Corinthum.——Habes Phillippos, &c. [4] Optat. lib. i. p. 39. Ipsi Apices, et Principes omnium Episcopi. [5] Hieron. Com. in Esai. iii. [6] Hieron. Com. in Psal. xliv. Principes Ecclesiæ, id est, Episcopi. Id. Com. in Esai. v. et Tit. i. [7] Hieron. Com. in Esai. lx. Scripturæ S. admiranda Majestas, quòd Principes futuros Ecclesiæ Episcopos nominavit.

calls those, who were to be bishops in future ages, by the name of princes." In the Greek writers they are styled ἄρχοντες ἐκκλησιῶν, governors and princes likewise; as frequently in[1] Eusebius, Origen,[2] Chrysostom,[3] and many others.

SECT 5.—*Præpositi*, Προεστῶτες, Πρόεδροι, Ἔφοροι.

In the same sense, Cyprian[4] and Tertullian,[5] commonly call them presidents, or provosts of the Church; which Eusebius[6] and Justin[7] Martyr call προεστῶτες, and sometimes πρόεδροι,[8] and others ἔφοροι,[9] *inspectors;* all which are proper characters of bishops; who have the care, presidency, and inspection of the Church.

SECT. 6.—*Principes Sacerdotum, Pontifices Maximi, Summi Sacerdotes, &c.*

And because this presidency was not only over the people, but also over the clergy, they were dignified upon that account with the distinguishing characters of, *Summi Sacerdotes, Pontifices Maximi*, and *Principes Sacerdotum, chief priests and princes of the clergy.* The author, under the name of St. Ambrose,[10] gives the bishop expressly the title of chief priest, and prince of the priests. And so frequently the name, *Summus Sacerdos*, is used by St. Jerom; as, where speaking of himself, he says, "in the opinion of all men, he was thought worthy of the high priesthood," he explains[11] himself to mean a bishopric. And in another place,[12] "the prosperity of the Church depends upon the honour of the chief priest." The same title is given to all bishops by the

---

[1] Euseb. Hist. lib. vi. c. 28. lib. viii. c. 1. et 3. It. de Martyr. Palæst. c. 1. [2] Origen Hom. 11. in Jerem. Cont. Cels. lib. iii. p. 129. [3] Chrys. de sacerdot. lib. iii. c. 15. Id. Hom. 3. ad Pop. Antioch. t. i. p. 48. [4] Cypr. Ep. 3, 9, 13, 27, 81. Ed. Oxon. Præsepositi. [5] Tertul. Apol. c. 39. Ad. Uxor. lib. i. c. 7. De Cor. Mil. c. 3. [6] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 3, 8, 10. lib. vii. c. 13. lib. viii. c. 6. [7] Just. Apol. 2. Chrysost. Hom. 3. in Colos. [8] Euseb. lib. viii. c. 2. It de Martyr. Palæst. c. 2. [9] Philostorg. Hist. lib. iii. c. 6. [10] Ambros. Com. in Eph. 4. In Episcopo omnes Ordines sunt, quia Primus Sacerdos est, hoc est, Princeps Sacerdotum. [11] Hieron. Ep. 99. ad Asellam. Omnium penè judicio dignus summo Sacerdotio decernebar. [12] Id. Dial. c. Lucifer. p. 139. Ecclesiæ salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet.

author[1] of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament under the name of St. Austin; Sidonius[2] calls them *Summi pontifices*, where he speaks only of the bishops of France. And therefore when Tertullian[3] gives the title of *Pontifex Maximus* to the bishop of Rome, he does him no greater honour, than in those days was done to every bishop in the world; and some think he meant not the bishop of Rome in particular, but comprehended all others under that title. As it is certain the council of Agde does, when it orders[4] every Metropolitan to call his suffragans, *ad ordinationem summi pontificis;* which means not, to the ordination of the Pope of Rome, but to the ordination of any French bishop within the Metropolitan's province or jurisdiction. For then, as we have seen, *Summus Pontifex* was the ordinary title of every bishop whatsoever.

SECT. 7.—Every Bishop anciently called *Papa*, *Father*, or *Pope*.

And so was the name *Papa*, though now it is become the pretended prerogative and sole privilege of the bishop of Rome. Some historians[5] indeed are so vain as to assert confidently, that Cyril of Alexandria was the first bishop in those parts who had the honour of being called *Papa*, and that because he was Pope Celestine's legate in the council of Ephesus. The Arabic writers, Homaidius and Abubacrus Habasides, cited by Echellensis and bishop Pearson,[6] deliver a quite contrary story; that the name was first given to the patriarch of Alexandria, and thence carried to Rome; which seems to be said, in answer to the Romish pretences. But the truth of the matter is, that it was no peculiar privilege of one patriarch or other, but the common title of all bishops who were called fathers[7] of the Church, and fathers of the Clergy; and *Papa* means no more. Therefore Tertullian, in his book *de Pudicitia*, c. 13. speaking indefinitely

[1] Aug. Quæst. Vet. et N. Test. c. 101. Quid est Episcopus nisi primus Presbyter, id est, summus Sacerdos? [2] Sidon. lib. iv. ep. 11. lib. viii. ep. 5. [3] Tertul. de Pudicit. c. 1. [4] Con. Agathens. c. 35. [5] Nicephorus is cited and chastised by Savaro for this. Vid. Savaro Not. in Sidon. lib. vi. ep. 1. [6] Pearson Vind. Ignat. part i. c. 11. p. 220. [7] Aug. Com. in Psal. xliv. p. 169. Ipsa Ecclesia Patres illos appellat. Chrysost. Hom. 3. ad Popul. Antioch. t. i. p. 43. [8] Hieron. Ep. 62. ad Theoph. Episcopi contenti sint honore suo: Patres se sciant esse, non Dominos. Id. Ep. 2 et 3. ad Nepotian. Com. in Psal. xliv. &c.

of any Christian bishop, who absolves penitents, gives him the name of *Benedictus Papa*. Or, if we suppose, as some do, that he speaks particularly of the bishop of Rome, yet there is nothing singular in it; for at the same time, Dionysius, presbyter of Alexandria, speaking of Heraclas, his bishop, gives him the very same title,[1] the blessed pope Heraclas. And Arius himself,[2] in one of his epistles, speaks of his bishop Alexander in the same style. St. Jerom gives the title[3] to Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Paulinus; and writing often to St. Austin, he always inscribes[4] his epistles, *Beatissimo Papæ Augustino*. So among Cyprian's epistles, those that are written to him are usually inscribed[5] in the same manner, *Cypriano Papæ*. And the clergy of Rome themselves[6] give him the title of *Benedictus Papa*, and *Beatissimus* and *Gloriosissimus Papa Cyprianus*. It were easy to add many other testimonies out of Epiphanius, and Constantine's epistles, and the Theodosian code, and especially Sidonius Apollinaris,[7] who always gives the French bishops the style of *Dominus Papa*. But in so plain a case I need not insist any longer, especially since a learned Romanist[8] has undertaken to prove, out of authors as late as Photius and Gregory of Tours, that *Papa* was the common name of all bishops for several ages; who also notes out of Balsamon, that this name was sometimes given to the inferior Clergy, who were called *Papæ Pisinni, little fathers;* and their tonsure or crown thence called παπαλήτρα, *the tonsure of the fathers*. In comparison of whom, Balsamon[9] calls presbyters and the *Chorepiscopi*, *Protopapæ*, and *Protopapades, chief fathers;* speaking in the language of his own times, when the *Chorepiscopi* and presbyters were become all one.

---

[1] Dionys. Ep. ad Philemon. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. 7. Παρὰ τῷ μακαρίῳ Πάπα ἡμῶν Ἡρακλᾶ. [2] Arius Ep. ad Euseb. Nicom. ap. Theod. lib. i. c. 5. ap. Epiphan. Hær. 69. Arian. [3] Hieron. Ep. 61. ad Pammach. p. 163. [4] Id. Ep. 17, 18, 25, 30. inter Epist. Augustini. [5] Cypr. Ep. 23, 31, 36. Edit. Oxon. [6] Ep. 8. Cleri Rom. ad Cler. Carthag. ibid. Didicimus secessisse Benedictum Papam Cyprianum. Ep. 30. Cler. Rom. ad Cypr. Beatissime ac Gloriosissime Papa. [7] Sidon. lib. vi. epist. 1. Domino Papæ Lupo. lib. vi. ep. 2. Papæ Pragmatio. lib. vi. ep. 3. Domino Papæ Leontio. And so for twelve epistles together. [8] Savaro Comment. in Sidon. lib. vi. ep. 1. p. 379. [9] Balsam. Com. in Can. Apost. c. 50. It. in Con. Antioch. can. 10.

SECT. 8.—*Pater Patrum*, and *Episcopus Episcoporum*.

But bishops had still a more honourable title than that of *Papa*; for they were commonly called *Patres Patrum*, and *Episcopi Episcoporum*, *fathers of fathers*, and *bishops of bishops*. The first that had this title was James, bishop of Jerusalem; which made the counterfeit author under the name of Clemens Romanus[1] inscribe an epistle (as directed to him) with this title; *Clemens Jacobo Domino, Episcopo Episcoporum*, &c. To which Sidonius Apollinaris[2] alludes plainly, when writing to Lupus, an eminent French bishop, he tells him, "he was father of fathers, and bishops of bishops, and another James of his age." By this we understand what Tertullian[3] means, when speaking ironically of the Catholic bishops, who admitted adulterers into communion again upon their repentance, he says, "I hear there is a decree published, and that a peremptory one; the chief pontiff, the bishop of bishops saith, I forgive the sins of adultery and fornication, to all those that repent of them." Some[4] take this for a peculiar character of the bishop of Rome; and I will not deny, but that Tertullian might intend more especially to reflect upon him. But yet there is nothing singular in the title, which did not belong to other bishops as well as him; as appears from what has been already cited out of Sidonius. To which we may add the testimony of Athanasius,[5] who styles Hosius the father of bishops; and Gregory Nazianzen[6] gives the same title to his own father, as St. Jerom[7] does to Epiphanius, styling him the father of all bishops. Cotelerius[8] observes, that Gregory Nyssen is called πατὴρ πατέρων, *father of fathers*, by the second council of Nice; and others[9] say, Theodosius, the emperor, gave Chrysostom the same honourable title after death. As to

---

[1] Pseudo-Clem. Ep. 1. ad Jacob. [2] Sidon. lib. vi. ep. 1. Tu Pater Patrum, et Episcopus Episcoporum, et alter sæculi tui Jacobus. [3] Tertul. de Pudicit. c. 1. Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium, Pontifex scilicet Maximus, Episcopus Episcoporum dicit, Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta pœnitentiâ defunctis dimitto. [4] Baron. an. 142. n. 4. an. 216. n. 4. Georg. Ambianas Observ. in Tertul. t. iii. p. 632. [5] Athan. Epist. ad solit. vit. agentes. t. i. p. 837. [6] Naz. Orat. 19. de Fun. Patr. p. 314. [7] Hier. t. Ep. lxi. p. 167. [8] Coteler. Not. in Ep. Clem. p. 605 [9] Niceph. lib. xiv. c. 43.

ason of these names, it is probable some bishops have them upon the account of personal merit, and from the eminency of their sees; as the bishop of ndria, to whom Balsamon[1] gives the title of *Pater* m, many ages after. But there was a more general why all bishops should be called so, as may be col- from[2] Epiphanius; who says, "that the order of s, was an order that begat fathers to the Church;" that hops made bishops by ordination; whereas presbyters only beget sons, by the power which they had of ing. And therefore, though we sometimes find pres- called fathers, yet we no where find the title of *Pater* given to any of their order. Yet I must here also e, that several of these titles were never kindly re- among the African fathers; because the bishops of began to abuse them, to establish an usurped autho- er their neighbours. Therefore, in two African coun- ld at Carthage, the one under[3] Cyprian, the other[4] Austin's time, these titles, *Episcopus Episcoporum*, *eps Sacerdotum*, and *Summus Sacerdos*, were dis- enanced and forbidden, insomuch that the primates elves were not allowed to use them; but of this more ter, when we come to speak of metropolitans.

SECT. 9.—Bishops sometimes called Patriarchs.

gory Nazianzen, in his rhetorical way, usually gives ps the title of patriarchs; by which, he means not pa- s in the proper sense, as the word came afterward to d in the Church, to signify bishops of the larger sees, had primates and metropolitans under them, but any s whatsoever, that were heads of their own family; , the Church subject to them. Thus he styles his

---

mm. Resp. ad Interrogat. Marci ap. Leunclav. Jus Gr. Rom. t. i. lib. v. Κύριος Μάρκος πατέρων πατὴρ ὑπάρχων, &c. [2] Epiphan. Hær. ian. Πατέρων γεννητικὴ τάξις. Πατέρας γὰρ γεννᾷ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Carthag. ap. Cypr. p. 229. Neque enim quisquam nostrûm Episcopum coporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem suos adigit. [4] Con. Carth. iii. c. 26. Ut primæ sedis Episco- appelletur Princeps Sacerdotum, aut Summus Sacerdos, aut aliquid di, sed tantùm primæ sedis Episcopus.

own father, Patriarch,[1] though he was but bishop of Nazianzum, a very small city in Cappadocia, under Cæsarea, the metropolis. And in his oration[2] before the council of Constantinople, he gives the same title to all other bishops, complaining of the Arian cruelties against them: "Have we not had," says he, "our ancient bishops, or to speak more properly, our patriarchs, publicly murdered by them?" In another place, complaining of the corrupt promotions and practices of some bishops of his age, he thus takes his leave of them:[3] "*Valete; insolentes esto; patriarchatus per sortes inter vos distribuite.*"—*Farewell; go on in your insolence; divide the patriarchal dignities among you; translate yourselves from see to see; set up some, pull down others.* Where it is evident he speaks not of patriarchs, properly so called, but only of some ambitious spirits among the bishops, who turned all things into confusion, and did what they pleased with the preferments of the Church. Gregory Nyssen uses the same term for bishops, in his funeral oration upon Meletius, which he made in the council of Constantinople, where he gives all the bishops then in council, the title of patriarchs: "Behold[4] these patriarchs; all these are the sons of our Jacob;" meaning Meletius, whom he calls Jacob, for his age, and the rest patriarchs, in allusion to the twelve patriarchs, who were Jacob's children. Thus bishops were commonly styled, till such times as the name patriarch became the appropriate title of the most eminent bishops, such as Rome, Constantinople, &c. And even some ages after that, de Marca[5] observes, that Athalaricus and the rest of the Gothish kings in Italy gave the name of patriarchs to all bishops within their dominions.

Sect. 10.—And Vicars of Christ.

It must not here be forgotten, that all bishops anciently were styled also, vicars of Christ, and had as much interest in that name as he that has since laid so much claim to

---

[1] Naz. Orat. xix. p. 312. Orat. xx. de Laud. Basil. p. 342. Orat. xli. p. 675.
[2] Orat. xxxii. p. 525. [3] Naz. Cygn. Carm. de Episcopis, t. ii. p. 308.
[4] Greg. Nyss. Orat. de Fun. Melet. t. iii. p. 589. [5] Marca Dissert. de Primatib. n. xx. p. 112.

the title. The author of the Questions,[1] under the name of St. Austin, says expressly, "That every bishop is the vicar of God." Cyprian says the same in several of his epistles,[2] "That every bishop is *Vice Christi, Christ's vicar or vicegerent.*" And this is his meaning in that noted passage to Cornelius, where[3] he says, "All heresies and schisms take their original from hence; that men do not submit to God's priest, and consider that there ought to be but one bishop in a Church at a time, and one judge as the vicar of Christ." This is spoken of every individual bishop thoughout the world, as Rigaltius[4] freely owns; and they grossly mistake Cyprian's meaning, and abuse his authority, who apply it only to the bishop of Rome. St. Basil[5] extends the title to all bishops; and so does the author under the name of St. Ambrose,[6] who is supposed to be Hilary, a deacon of the Church of Rome; which would have been an unpardonable oversight in him, had it not been then the custom of the world to give all others this title, as well as the bishop of Rome.

SECT. II.—And Angels of the Churches.

I shall but take notice of one title more given to bishops, which is that of angels of the Churches; a name, which some authors[7] suppose to be used by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 10. where he says, "Women ought to be covered in the Church, because of the angels," that is, bishops, says Hilary, the deacon, in the place last mentioned. And so the same author understands that of St. John, Rev. i. 20. "The seven stars are the angels[8] of the seven Churches;" which is also

---

[1] Ang. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test, c. 127. Antistitem Dei puriorem cæteris esse oportet.——Est enim Vicarius ejus. [2] Cypr. Ep. 63. ad Cæcil. Ille Sacerdos vice Christi verè fungitur, qui id, quod Christus fecit, imitatur. [3] Ep. 55. al. 50. ad Cornel. p. 129. Neque enim aliunde Hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quàm inde quòd Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesiâ ad tempus Sacerdos, et ad tempus Judex vice Christi cogitatur. [4] Rigalt. in Loc. Ecce autem Episcopos ævo jam Cypriani vicarios Christi. [5] Basil. Constit. Monach. c. 22. t. ii. p. 792. [6] Ambr. Com. in 1 Cor. xi. 10. Episcopus Personam habet Christi.——Vicarius Domini est, &c. The Author of the Constitutions, lib. ii. c. 26. styles the bishop Θεὸν ἐπίγειον. [7] Ambrosiaster, ibid. Angelos Episcopos dicit, sicut docetur in Apocalypsi Joannis. [8] Pseudo-Ambros. in 1 Cor. xi. 10.

the interpretation of St. Austin[1] and Epiphanius,[2] who say, that by angels we are not there to understand the celestial angels, as Origen thought, who assigns a guardian angel[3] to every church, but the bishops or governors of those seven churches. Hence, in after-ages, bishops were called angels of the churches; as Socrates[4] terms Serapion, who was bishop of Thmuis, "The angel of the Church of Thmuis." And the author of the short notes[5] upon Timothy, under the name of St. Jerom, says of every bishop, "That he is the angel of God Almighty." In this sense, Dr. Hammond[6] observes out of a Saxon MS., that in our own language, anciently, bishops were called God's *bydels*, that is, messengers, or officers, as he explains it from Sir Henry Spelman's Glossary, in the word *Bedellus*. And thus much of those ancient titles of honour which were given to all bishops indifferently in the primitive Church.

CHAP. III.

Of the Offices of Bishops as distinct from Presbyters.

SECT. I.—A threefold Difference between Bishops and Presbyters in the Discharge of their Office and Functions.

I come now to consider the episcopal office and function itself; where, to do justice to antiquity, it is necessary for me to observe a threefold distinction, between bishops and presbyters, in the discharge of ecclesiastical offices. For 1st, in the common offices, which were ordinarily entrusted in the hands of presbyters, such as preaching, baptizing, administering the eucharist, &c. there was this obvious difference betwixt a bishop and a presbyter; that the one acted by an absolute and independent power,—the other, in dependence upon, and subordination to, his bishop; by whose authority and directions, under God, he was to be governed,

---

[1] Aug. Ep. 162. Divinâ voce laudatur sub Angeli nomine Præpositus Ecclesiæ. [2] Epiph. Hær. 25. Nicolait. [3] Orig. Hom. 20, in Num. t. i. p. 251. So also Andreas Cæsariens. Ἄγγελοι φύλακες. Com. in Apoc. i. 20. [4] Socrat. lib. iv. c. 23. [5] Hieron. Com. 1 Tim. iii.
[6] Ham. Annot. on Rev. i. 20.

and do nothing without his consent, or against it: so that, though there was no difference in the things that were done, yet there was an essential difference in the power of doing them. This is an observation not commonly made; but it is of very great use, both for establishing the just bounds of episcopal and presbyterial power, and clearing the practice of the primitive Church. 2dly. Some offices were never entrusted in the hands of presbyters; nor allowed, if performed by them; such as the ordination of bishops, presbyters, &c. 3dly. Bishops always retained the power of calling their presbyters to an account, and censuring them for their misdemeanours in the discharge of their office; which presbyters could not do by their bishop, being always subject and subordinate to him as their superior. These things cleared, and set in a fair light, will give us a just account of the offices of a bishop, as distinct from that of a presbyter, in the primitive Church.

SECT. 2.—1. In the common Offices which might be performed by both; the Bishop acted by an Independent Power; but Presbyters in Dependence upon, and Subordination to him.

First then, we are to observe, that in such ordinary and common offices as might be performed by both, bishops and presbyters acted by a different power; the bishop was the absolute, independent minister of the Church, and did whatever he did by his own authority, solely inherent in himself; but the presbyters were only his assistants, authorised to perform such offices as he entrusted them with, or gave them commission and directions to perform, which they still did by his authority, and in dependence upon, and subordination to him as their superior; and might do nothing against his will, or independent of him. This is clear from many passages in Ignatius, Cyprian, and the canons of the ancient councils, which all agree in this,—That nothing is to be done without the bishop; that is, without his knowledge, without his consent, directions, or approbation. Thus Ignatius,[1] in his epistle to the Church of Smyrna; "Let no

[1] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

one perform any ecclesiastical office without the bishop;" which he explains, both there and elsewhere,[1] to mean, without his authority and permission. So, in the council[2] of Laodicea, it is expressed the same way; "The presbyters shall do nothing without the consent of the bishop." The councils of Arles[3] and Toledo[4] say, "without his privity or knowledge." And the Apostolical Canons[5] give a reason for all this: "Because the bishop is the man to whom the Lord's people are committed; and he must give an account of their souls."

SECT. 3.—This specified in the Offices of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper.

This rule they particularly apply to the offices of baptism, and the Lord's supper. A presbyter might ordinarily administer both these sacraments; but not against the will of his bishop, or in opposition or contradiction to him, but by his consent and authority, in a due subordination to him as his superior. "It is not lawful," says Ignatius,[6] "either to baptize, or celebrate the eucharist, without the bishop; but that which he allows is well-pleasing to God." He does not say that none but a bishop might administer these sacraments, but that none was to do it without his allowance and approbation. And that is plainly the meaning of Tertullian[7] and St. Jerom,[8] when they say that presbyters and deacons have no power to baptize without the command and authority of the bishop or chief-priest; and that this is for the honour of the Church, and the preservation of peace and unity. St. Ambrose[9] asserts the same, "That though presbyters do baptize, yet they derive their authority from their superior."

---

[1] Id. Ep. ad Polycarp. n. 4. Μηδὲν ἄνευ γνώμης σου γινέσθω. [2] Con. Laodic. can. 56. Ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. [3] Con. Arelat. 1 can. 19. Ut Presbyteri sine conscientiâ Episcoporum nihil faciant. [4] Con. Tolet. 1. can. 20. Sine conscientiâ Episcopi nihil penitus Presbyteri agere præsumant. [5] Can. Apost. c. 39. [6] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. [7] Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17. Dandi jus quidem habet summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus: dehinc Presbyteri, et Diaconi; non tamen sine Episcopi Auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo, salva Pax est. [8] Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucifer. p. 139. Inde venit, ut sine jussione Episcopi, neque Presbyter, neque Diaconus, jus habeant baptisandi. [9] Ambros. de sacram. lib. iii. c. 1. Licet Presbyteri fecerint, tamen exordium ministerii à summo est Sacerdote.

SECT. 4.—And in the Office of Preaching.

The like observation may be made upon the office of preaching. This[1] was, in the first place, the bishops' office, which they commonly discharged themselves, especially in the African Churches; which is the reason we so often meet with the phrase, *Tractante Episcopo, the bishop preaching*, in the writings[2] of St. Cyprian. For then it was so much the office and custom of bishops to preach, that no presbyter was permitted to preach in their presence, till the time of St. Austin, who, whilst he was a presbyter, was authorised by Valerius, his bishop, to preach before him. But that, as Possidius,[3] the writer of his life, observes, was so contrary to the use and custom of the African Churches, that many bishops were highly offended at it, and spake against it; till the consequence proved, that such a permission was of good use and service to the Church; and then several other bishops granted their presbyters power and privilege to preach before them. So that it was then a favour for presbyters to preach in the presence of their bishops, and wholly at the bishops' discretion whether they would permit them or not; and when they did preach, it was *Potestate acceptâ*, by the power and authority of the bishops that appointed them. In the Eastern Churches presbyters were more commonly employed to preach, as Possidius[4] observes, when he says, Valerius brought the custom into Afric, from their example. And St. Jerom intimates as much, when he complains[5] of it as an ill custom only in some Churches, to forbid presbyters to preach. Chrysostom preached several of his elaborate discourses at Antioch, whilst he was but a presbyter; and so did Atticus,[6] at Constantinople. And the same is observed to

---

[1] Vid. Can. Apost. c. 58. [2] Cypr. Ep. 52, 56, 83. Ed. Oxon. It. Pontius Vit. Cypr. Ibid. [3] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 5. Eidem Presbytero potestatem dedit coram se in Ecclesiâ Evangelium prædicandi, ac frequentissimè tractandi, contra usum quidem ac consuetudinem Africanarum Ecclesiarum. Unde etiam ei nonnulli Episcopi detrahebant.——Postea, bono præcedente exemplo, acceptâ ab Episcopis potestate, Presbyteri nonnulli coram Episcopis populo tractare cœperunt verbum Dei. [4] Ille in Orientalibus Ecclesiis id ex more fieri sciens, obtrectantium non curabat linguas, &c. Possid. Ibid. [5] Pessima consuetudinis est in quibusdam Ecclesiis tacere Presbyteros, et præsentibus Episcopis non loqui, &c. [6] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 2.

have been granted to the presbyters[1] of Alexandria, and Cæsarea in Cappadocia,[2] and Cyprus, and other places. But still it was but a grant of the bishops, and presbyters did it by their authority and commission; and whenever bishops saw just reason to forbid them, they had power to limit or withdraw their commission again; as both Socrates[3] and Sozomen[4] testify, who say, that at Alexandria presbyters were forbidden to preach, from the time that Arius raised a disturbance in the Church. Thus we see what power bishops anciently challenged and exercised over presbyters in the common and ordinary offices of the Church; particularly for preaching, bishops always esteemed it their office, as much as any other. Such a vast difference was there between the practice of the primitive Church and the bishops of Rome in after-ages! "When," as Blondel observes out of Surius, "there was a time when the bishops of Rome were not known to preach for five hundred years together; insomuch, that when Pius Quintus made a sermon, it was looked upon as a prodigy, and was, indeed, a greater rarity than the *Sæculares Ludi* were in old Rome." See Blondel Apolog. p. 58, and *Surius Comment. Rer. in Orbe gestar.*

SECT. 5.—2. The Office and Power of Ordination never entrusted in the Hands of Presbyters.

But to return to the bishops of the primitive Church. There were other offices, which they very rarely entrusted in the hands of presbyters; and if ever they granted them commission to perform them, it was only in cases of great necessity. Such were the offices of reconciling penitents, confirmation of Neophytes, consecration of Churches, virgins and widows, with some others of the like nature; of which I shall speak nothing more particularly here now, because they will come more properly under consideration in other places. But there was one office which they never entrusted in the hands of presbyters, nor ever gave them any commission to perform; which was, the office of or-

[1] Theodor. lib. i. c. 2. [2] Socrat. lib. v. c. 2. [3] Socrat. ibid. [4] Sozom. lib. vii. c. 17.

daining the superior clergy, bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The utmost that presbyters could pretend to in this matter, was to lay on their hands, together with the bishop, in the ordination of a presbyter, whilst the bishop, by his prayer, performed the office of consecration. Thus much is allowed them by one of the councils[1] of Carthage, which yet expressly reserves the benediction or ordination prayer to the bishop only. In the ordination of bishops they had no concern at all; which was always performed by a synod of bishops, as shall be showed more particularly when we come to speak of the rites and customs observed in their ordinations. Here, in this place, it will be sufficient to prove, in general, that the power of ordinations was the prerogative of bishops, and that they never communicated this privilege to any presbyters. St. Jerom's[2] testimony is irrefragable evidence in this case; for in the same place, where he sets off the office of presbyters to the best advantage, he still excepts the power of ordination. "What is it," says he, "that a bishop does more than a presbyter, setting aside the business of ordination?" St. Chrysostom[3] speaks much after the same manner, where he advances the power of presbyters to the highest. "Bishops and presbyters," says he, "differ not much from one another; for presbyters are admitted to preach, and govern the Church; and the same qualifications that the Apostle requires in bishops, are required in presbyters also: for bishops are superior to them only in the power of ordination, and have that one thing more than they." In another place[4] he proves that Timothy was a bishop, because the Apostle speaks of his power to ordain, bidding him "lay hands suddenly on no man;" and he adds, both there and elsewhere,[5] that the presbytery which ordained Timothy was a synod of bishops, because mere presbyters had no power to ordain a bishop.

---

[1] Con. Carth. 4. can. 3. Presbyter cum ordinatur, Episcopo eum benedicente, et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri, qui præsentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput illius teneant. [2] Hieron Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Quid enim facit, exceptâ Ordinatione, Episcopus, quod Presbyter non facit? [3] Chrys. Hom. 11. in 1 Tim. iii. 8. [4] Id. Hom. 1. in Philip 1. [5] Hom. 13. in 1 Tim. iv. 14. εἰ γὰρ δὴ πρεσβύτεροι ἐπισκοπον ἐχειροτόνουν.

I might here produce all those canons of the ancient councils which speak of bishops ordaining,[1] but never of presbyters; which rule was so precisely observed in the primitive Church, that Novatian himself would not presume to break it, but sent for three bishops[2] from the furthest corners of Italy, rather than want a canonical number of bishops to ordain him. I only add that observation of Epiphanius,[3] grounded upon the general practice of the Church, "That the order of bishops begets fathers to the Church, which the order of presbyters cannot do; but only begets sons by the regeneration of baptism."

I know, some urge the authority of St. Jerom,[4] to prove that the presbyters of Alexandria ordained their own bishop, from the days of St. Mark to the time of Heraclas and Dionysius; and others think the same words prove, that he had no new ordination at all. But they both mistake St. Jerom's meaning, who speaks not of the ordination of the bishop, but of his election; who was chosen by the presbyters, out of their own body, and by them placed upon the bishop's throne; which, in those days, was no more than a token of his election, and was sometimes done by the people; but the ordination came after that, and was always reserved for the provincial bishops to perform, as shall be showed hereafter.

Sect. 6.—Ordinations by Presbyters disannulled by the Church.

But it may be inquired,—what was the practice of the Church in case any presbyters took upon them to ordain? were their ordinations allowed to stand good or not? I answer,—they were commonly reversed and disannulled. As in the known case of Ischyras,[5] who was deposed by the synod of Alexandria, because Colluthus, who ordained him, was no more than a presbyter, though pretending to be

---

[1] See Con. Nic. c. 19. Con. Antioch. c. 9. Con. Chalced. c. 2 et 6. Con. Carth. iii. c. 45. Can. Apost. c. 1. [2] Cornel. Ep. ad Fabium ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 22. [3] Epiph. Hær. 75. Aerian. [4] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Alexandriæ à Marco Evangelistâ usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant; quomodo si Exercitus Imperatorem faciat.

[5] Athan. Apol. ii. p. 732. Epist. Cler. Mareot. ibid. p. 784.

a bishop; and in the case of those presbyters who were reduced to the quality of laymen by the council[1] of Sardica, because Eutychianus and Musæus, who ordained them, were only pretended bishops. The council of Seville, in Spain,[2] went a little further: they deposed a presbyter and two deacons, because the bishop only laid his hands upon them, whilst a presbyter pronounced the blessing or consecration prayer over them. And some instances might be added of the like nature, which show that then they did not allow bishops so much as to delegate or commission presbyters to ordain in their name, but reserved this entirely to the episcopal function.

SECT. 7.—Some Allegations to the contrary examined.

The common pleas, which some urge to the contrary, derogate nothing from the truth of this observation. For whereas it is said, 1st. That the *Chorepiscopi* were only presbyters, and yet had power to ordain; that seems to be a plain mistake; for all the *Chorepiscopi* of the ancient Church were real bishops, though subordinate to other bishops, as I shall show more particularly hereafter, when I come to speak of their order. 2dly. It is said, that the city-presbyters had power to ordain by the bishop's license; and that this was established by canon in the council of Ancyra.[3] But this is grounded only upon a very ambiguous sense, if not a corrupt reading, of that canon. For all the old translators render it much otherwise; that the city-presbyters shall do nothing[4] without the license and authority of the bishop, in any part of the paroche or diocese belonging to his jurisdiction; which agrees with what I have cited before out of the council of Laodicea, and several other canons, which make presbyters dependent upon their

[1] Con. Sard. can. 20. [2] Con. Hispal. ii. can. 5. Relatum est nobis de quibusdam Clericis, quorum dum unus ad Presbyterum, duo ad Levitarum ministerium sacrarentur, Episcopus oculorum dolore detentus fertur manum suam super eos tantùm imposuisse, et Presbyter quidam illis contra Ecclesiasticum ordinem benedictionem dedisse, &c. Hi gradum Sacerdotii vel Levitici ordinis, quem perversè adepti sunt, amittunt. [3] Con. Ancyr. can. 13.
[4] Id. ex Versione Dionysii Exigui: Sed nec Presbyteris Civitatis, sine Præcepto Episcopi, amplius aliquid imperare, nec sine authoritate Literarum ejus in unaquaque Parochiâ aliquid agere.

bishops in the ordinary exercise of their function. (See before, sect. 2 of this chapter.) And some Greek copies[1] read it, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ, which seems to signify that presbyters shall not officiate in another diocese without letters dimissory from their own bishop.

3dly. It is urged further, that Novatus, a presbyter of Carthage, ordained Felicissimus, a deacon; but this seems to be no more than procuring him to be ordained by some bishop. For Cyprian says, he made Novatian[2] bishop of Rome after the same manner as he had done Felicissimus deacon at Carthage. But now it is certain he did not ordain Novatian, but only was instrumental in procuring three obscure Italian bishops to come and ordain him; and in that sense he might ordain Felicissimus too. But admit it were otherwise, it was only a schismatical act, condemned by Cyprian and the whole Church.

4thly. It is pleaded out of Cassian, "That Paphnutius, an Egyptian abbot, ordained one Daniel, a presbyter." But, if Cassian's words be rightly considered, he says no such thing, but only[3] that Paphnutius first promoted him to be made a deacon before several of his seniors; and then, intending to make him his successor, he also preferred him to the dignity of a presbyter, which preference or promotion does not at all exclude the bishop's ordination. It may reasonably signify, the abbot's choice, which he had power to make; but it cannot so reasonably be interpreted that he ordained him, since this was contrary to the rules and practice of the Church: and considering where and when Paphnutius lived, in the midst of Egypt, among a hundred bishops, in the fifth century, it is not likely he would transgress the canons in so plain a case. Therefore I cannot subscribe to a learned man,[4] who says, "Nothing is

---

[1] Cod. Can. edit. Ehinger. [2] Cypr. Ep. 49. al. 52. ad Cornel. p. 97. ed. Oxon. Quoniam pro magnitudine suâ debeat Carthaginem Româ præcedere, illic majora et graviora commisit. Qui istic adversus Ecclesiam Diaconum fecerat, illic Episcopum fecit. [3] Cassian. Collat. iv. c. 1. A beato Paphnutio solitudinis ejusdem Presbytero, et quidem cum multis junior esset ætate, ad Diaconii est prælatus Officium.———Optansque sibimet successorem dignissimum providere, superstes eum Presbyterii honore provexit.
[4] Stilling. Irenic. par. ii. c. 7. n. 8. p. 380.

more plain and evident, than that here a presbyter ordained a presbyter, which we no where read was pronounced null by Theophilus, then bishop of Alexandria, nor any others at that time." I conceive the contrary was rather evident to them, and therefore they had no reason to pronounce it null, knowing it to be a just and regular ordination.

5thly. I remember but one instance more in ancient Church-history (for modern instances I wholly pass by) that seems to make any thing for the ordination of presbyters; and that is, in the answer given by Pope Leo to a question put to him by Rusticus Narbonensis, "Whether the ordination of certain persons might stand good, who were only ordained by some *Pseudo-Episcopi, false bishops*, who had no legal and canonical right to their places?" To this he answers,[1] "That if the lawful bishops of those Churches gave their consent to their ordination, it might be esteemed valid, and allowed; otherwise to be disannulled." But here it is to be considered, that these *Pseudo-Episcopi* were in some sense bishops, as being ordained, though illegally, to their places; for they seem to be such as had schismatically intruded themselves into other men's sees, or at least obtained them by some corrupt and irregular practices. Now the Church did not always rescind and cancel the acts of such bishops, but used a liberty either to reverse and disannul the ordinations made by them, or otherwise to confirm and ratify them, as she saw occasion. Therefore, though the general-council[2] of Constantinople deposed all such as were ordained by Maximus, who had simoniacally intruded himself into Gregory Nazianzen's see, at Constantinople, yet the Novatian clergy were admitted by the council of Nice[3] though ordained by schismatical bishops; and the African councils[4] allowed the ordinations of the Donatist bishops, though they had not long continued in schism, and given schismatical orders to others also; which shows, that the primitive Church made

[1] Leo Ep. xcii. ad Rustic. c. 1. Si qui autem Clerici ab istis Pseudo-Episcopis in eis Ecclesiis ordinati sunt, quæ ad proprios Episcopos pertinebant, et Ordinatio eorum cum consensu et judicio Præsidentium facta est, potest rata haberi, &c. [2] Con. Constant. can. 4. [3] Con. Nic. c. 8.
[4] Collat. Carthag. 1. Die. c. 16.

some difference between orders conferred by schismatical bishops, and those conferred by mere presbyters. I inquire not now into the grounds and reasons of this, but only relate the Church's practice; from which, upon the whole matter, it appears, that this was another difference betwixt bishops and presbyters, that the one had power to ordain, but the other were never authorised or commissioned to do it.

SECT. 8.—3. A Third Difference between Bishops and Presbyters;—Presbyters accountable to their Bishops, not Bishops to their Presbyters.

Besides this, there was a third difference between bishops and presbyters in point of jurisdiction. Bishops always retained to themselves the power of calling presbyters to an account, and censuring them for their miscarriages in the discharge of their office; but presbyters had no power to censure their bishops, or set up an independent power in opposition to their authority and jurisdiction. When Felicissimus and Augendus set up a separate communion at Carthage against Cyprian, threatening to excommunicate all that communicated with him, Cyprian gave orders to his deputies, being himself then in banishment, to execute, first, their own sentence upon them, and let them, for their contempt of him and the Church,[1] feel the power of excommunication; which was accordingly done by his delegates, as appears from their answer[2] to him. In another place, writing to Rogatian, a bishop, who made complaint to Cyprian and the synod of an unruly deacon, he tells him, "It was his singular modesty to refer the case to them, when he might, by virtue of his own episcopal authority, himself have punished the delinquent;[3] against whom, if he persisted in his contempt, he should use the

[1] Cypr. Ep. xxxviii. al. xli. p. 80. Cum Felicissimus comminatus sit, non communicaturos in monte (al. morte) secum, qui nobis communicarent. Accipiat sententiam quam prior dixit, ut abstentum a se nobis sciat.

[2] Ep. xxxix al. xlii. ad Cypr. Abstinuimus communicatione Felicissimum et Augendum, &c. [3] Cypr. Ep. lxv. al. iii. ad Rogatian. Tu quidem pro solitâ tuâ humilitate fecisti, ut malles de eo nobis conqueri, cum pro Episcopatûs vigore et Cathedræ auctoritate haberes potestatem, quâ posses de illo statim vindicari.——Quod si ultra te contumeliis suis provocaverit, fungeris circa eum potestate honoris tui, ut eum vel deponas vel, abstineas.—See also Cypr. Ep. x. al. xvi. ed. Oxon.

power which belonged to his order, and either depose or suspend him." Nothing can be more plain and evident, than that, in Cyprian's time, all bishops were invested with this power of censuring delinquents among the clergy. And any one that looks into the councils of the following age, will find nothing more common, than canons which both suppose and confirm this power. As when the Apostolical Canons say,[1] "that no presbyter, or deacon, excommunicated by his own bishop, should be received by any other," that supposes all bishops to have power to inflict ecclesiastical censures upon their clergy. The like may be seen in the canons of the council of Nice,[2] which allows an appeal, in such a case, to a provincial synod; and the council of Sardica,[3] which orders the metropolitan to hear and redress the grievance; so also in the councils of Antioch,[4] Chalcedon,[5] and many others.

SECT. 9.—Yet Bishops' Power not arbitrary, but limited by Canon in various Respects.

Yet it must be owned, that according to the discipline and custom of those times, bishops seldom did any thing of this nature, without the advice and consent of their presbyters, who were their assessors, and, as it were, the ecclesiastical senate and council of the Church; of which I shall give a more particular account when I come to speak of the honour and privileges of the order of presbyters. And here it is to be further noted, out of the preceding canons, that if any clergyman thought himself injured by his bishop, he had liberty to appeal[6] either to the metropolitan or a provincial synod. And in some places, the better to avoid arbitrary power, the canons provided, that no bishop should proceed to censure a presbyter or deacon, without the concurrence of some neighbouring bishops to join with him in the sentence. The first council of Carthage[7] requires three to censure a deacon, and six to

---

[1] Canon. Apost. c. 33. [2] Con. Nic. can. 5. [3] Con. Sard. 13, 14. [4] Con. Antioch. can. 3 et 4 [5] Chalced. can. 9.
[6] See for the Liberty of Appeals, Con. Carthag. ii. c. 8. Carthag. iv. c. 29, et 66. Antioch. c. 12. Vasion. c. 5. Venetic. can. 9. [7] Con. Carthag. 1. can. 11. Si quis aliquam causam habuerit, à tribus vicinis Episcopis, si Diaconus est, arguatur: Presbyter à sex.

censure a presbyter. The second council of Carthage[1] requires the same number, according to all correct editions of it; for Crab's edition is palpably false; and yet Blondel[2] lays hold of that corruption, to prove that presbyters and deacons were to be judges of their own bishop; which makes the canon speak mere nonsense, and appoints the bishop to judge himself also. The true reading of the canon is this: the criminal cause of a bishop shall be heard by twelve bishops; the cause of a presbyter, by six; the cause of a deacon, by three, joined with his own bishop. This obliges every bishop to take other bishops into commission with him in criminal causes, but does not authorize presbyters and deacons to sit as judges upon their own bishop; which may be further evidenced from another canon[3] of the next council of Carthage, which speaks of a legal number of bishops to judge a presbyter, or deacon; and assigns six for a presbyter, and three for a deacon, as the former canons appointed. But for the inferior clergy, there was no such restraint laid upon the bishop, that I can find; but he alone, by the same canon,[4] is allowed to hear their causes, and end them. Only they had liberty to appeal, as all others, in case of injury done them, to the metropolitan, or a provincial synod; which the Nicene council,[5] and many others, appoint to be held once or twice a year for that very purpose; that if any clergyman chanced to be unjustly censured by the passion of his bishop, he might have recourse to a superior court, and there have justice done him. This is the true state and account of the power of bishops over their clergy, as near as I can collect it out of the genuine records of the ancient Church.

---

[1] Con. Carth. 2. can. 10. Placet ut causa criminalis Episcopi à duodecim Episcopis audiatur; causa Presbyteri à sex; causa verò Diaconi à tribus cum proprio Episcopo. [2] Blondel. Apol. p. 137. And Crab thus reads it corruptly: Episcopus à duodecim Episcopis audiatur, et à sex Presbyteris, et à tribus Diaconibus cum proprio suo Episcopo. [3] Con. Carth. 3. c. 8. Si Presbyteri vel Diaconi fuerint accusati, adjuncto sibi ex vicinis locis legitimo numero collegarum - - - -in Presbyteri nomine sex, in Diaconi tribus, ipsorum causas discutiant. [4] Ibid. c. 8. Reliquorum Clericorum causas solus Episcopus loci agnoscat et finiat. [5] Con. Nic. can. 5.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Power of Bishops over the Laity, Monks, subordinate Magistrates, and all Persons within their Diocese; and of their Office in disposing of the Revenues of the Church.

Sect. 1.—No Exemptions from the Jurisdiction of the Bishop in the Primitive Church.

The next thing to be considered is, the power of bishops over the people; which, upon inquiry, will be found to extend itself over all persons, of what rank or quality soever, within their diocese, or the bounds and limits of their jurisdiction. The extent of dioceses themselves, and the reasons why some were much greater than others, I do not here consider; but reserve that for a more proper place, to be treated of when we come to speak of Churches. What I observe in this place is, that all orders of men within the diocese, were subject to the bishop; for, privileges to exempt men from the jurisdiction of their diocesan, were things unknown to former ages. Ignatius makes bold to say,[1] that, as he that honours his bishop, is honoured of God; so he, that does any thing covertly in opposition to him, is the servant of satan; and Cyprian defines the Church[2] to be a people united to its bishop, a flock adhering to its pastor. Whence the Church may be said to be in the bishop, and the bishop in the Church; and if any are not with their bishop, they are not in the Church.

Sect. 2.—All Monks subject to the Bishop of the Diocese, where they lived.

Particularly, we may observe of all ascetics, and monks, and hermits; that the laws, both ecclesiastical and civil, subjected them to the bishop of the place, where they lived. For ecclesiastical laws, we have two canons in the council of Chalcedon[3] to this purpose; the first of which prescribes,

---

[1] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 9. ὁ λάθρα ἐπισκόπου τι πράσσων, τῷ διαβόλῳ λατρεύει [2] Cypr. Epist. lxix. al. lxvi. ad Pupian. p. 168. Ecclesia Plebs Sacerdoti unita, et Pastori suo Grex adhærens. Unde scire debes Episcopum in Ecclesiâ esse, et Ecclesiam in Episcopo; Et si qui cum Episcopo non sint, in Ecclesiâ non esse, &c. [3] Con. Chalced. can. iv. et 8.

that all monks, whether in city or country, shall be subject to the bishop, and concern themselves in no business (sacred or civil) out of their own monastery; except they have his license and permission, upon urgent occasion so to do; and if any withdraw themselves from his obedience, the other canon pronounces excommunication against them. The same injunctions may be read in the Councils of Orleans,[1] Agde,[2] Lerida,[3] and others; which subject the abbots as well as monks, to the bishop's care and correction. Justinian confirms all this by a law in the code; which says,[4] "all monasteries are to be reckoned under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the territories, where they are; and that the abbots themselves are part of their care." In one of his novels,[5] the election of abbots is put into the bishop's hands. And, by other laws,[6] no new cells or monasteries were to be erected, but by the consent and license of the bishop, to whose jurisdiction they belonged. It is therefore a very just reflection, which Bede, and some others[7] from him, make upon the state of the Scottish Church; "that things were in a very unusual and preposterous order, when, instead of abbots being subject to the bishops, the bishops were subject to a single abbot." This was *Ordine inusitato*, as Bede[8] rightly observes; for there was no such practice allowed in the primitive Church.

Sect. 3.—As also all subordinate Magistrates in Matters of Spiritual Jurisdiction.

In those days, the authority of bishops was so highly esteemed, and venerable in the eyes of all men, that even the subordinate magistrates themselves were subject to their spiritual discipline and correction. The prefects and governors of cities and provinces were obliged to take their communicatory letters along with them to the bishop of the place, whither the government sent them; and whilst

---

[1] Con. Aurel. i. c. 21. [2] Agathens. can. 38. [3] Ilerdens. c. 3.
[4] Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episcop. leg. 40. [5] Justin. Novel. v. c. 9.
[6] Con. Chalced. can. iv. Con. Agath. c. 58. [7] Pearson Vind. Ignat. part i. c. 11. p. 333. [8] Bed. Hist. Gent. Anglor. lib. iii. c. 4. Cujus juri et omnis Provincia, et ipsi etiam Episcopi ordine inusitato debeant esse subjecti.

they continued in their office there, they were to be under the bishop's care; who, if they transgressed against the public discipline of the Church, was authorised by the imperial laws to punish them with excommunication. This we learn from a canon of the first council of Arles,[1] which was called by Constantine himself, who ratified its canons, and gave them, as it were, the force of imperial sanctions. And, by virtue of this power, they sometimes unsheathed the spiritual sword against impious and profane magistrates, and cut them off from all communion with the Church; of which we have an instance in Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais,[2] excommunicating Andronicus, the governor, for his cruelties and blasphemies; and many other such examples, which will be mentioned, when we come to treat particularly of the discipline of the Church. As to what concerns the bishop's power to inspect and examine the acts and decrees of subordinate magistrates, Socrates[3] assures us, it was practised by Cyril of Alexandria, in reference to Orestes the Præfectus Augustalis of Egypt; though, as he intimates, it was some grievance to him to be under his inspection.

Sect. 4.—Of the Distinction between Temporal and Spiritual Jurisdiction; Bishops' Power wholly confined to the latter.

But it must be owned and spoken to the glory of those primitive bishops, that they challenged no power, as of right belonging to them, but only that which was spiritual. They did not as yet lay claim to both swords, much less endeavoured to wrest the temporal sword out of the magistrate's hand, and dethrone princes under pretence of excommunication. The ancient bishops of Rome themselves always professed obedience and subjection to the emperor's laws; which I shall not stand here to prove, since it has so frequently and so substantially been done by several of our

---

[1] Con. Arelat. ii. c. 7. De Præsidibus - - - ita placuit, ut cum promoti fuerint, literas accipiant ecclesiasticas communicatorias: Ita tamen ut in quibuscunque locis gesserint, ab Episcopo ejusdem loci cura de illis agatur; at cum cœperint contra disciplinam publicam agere, tunc demum à Communione excludantur. Similiter et de his fiat, qui rempublicam agere volunt.

[2] Synes. Ep. 58. ad Episcopos, p. 198. [3] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 13.

learned[1] writers; and it is confessed by the more ingenuous of the Romish writers[2] themselves, that Gregory the VIIth was the first Pope that pretended to depose Christian princes. The ancient bishops of the Church laid no claim to a coercive power over the bodies or estates of men; but if ever they had occasion to make use of it, they applied themselves to the secular magistrate for his assistance. As in the case of Paulus Samosatensis, who kept possession of the bishop's house, after he was deposed from his bishopric by the council of Antioch. The fathers in that council, having no power to remove him, petitioned the emperor Aurelian[3] against him; who, though an heathen, gave judgment on their side, and ordered his officers to see his sentence put in execution. And thus the case stood, as to the power of bishops, for some ages after under Christian emperors; insomuch that Socrates[4] notes it as a very singular thing in Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, that he undertook by his own power, to shut up the Novatian Churches, seizing upon their plate and sacred utensils, and depriving their bishop Theopemptus of his substance. This was done παρὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τάξεως, beyond any ordinary power, that bishops were then invested with; and though in after ages they attained to this power, yet it was not by any inherent right of their order, but by the favour and indulgence of secular princes. It must here also be further noted, that it was ever esteemed dishonourable for bishops, so much as to petition the secular power against the life of any man, whom they had condemned by spiritual censures; and therefore, when Ithacius and some other Spanish bishops prevailed with Maximus to slay the heretic Priscillian, St. Martin and many other pious bishops petitioned against it, saying, it was enough to expel heretics[5] from the Churches; and when they could not prevail, they showed their resentments of the fact against

---

[1] See bishop Morton's Grand Impost. of the Church of Rome, c. 11. Joh. Roffens. de Potest. Papæ in Temporal. lib. ii. c. 2. [2] Otho Frisingens. Chron. lib. vi. c. 35. Greg. Tholosan. de Repub. lib. 26. c. 5.
[3] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 30. [4] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 7. [5] Sulph. Sever. lib. ii. p. 119. Maximum orare, ut sanguine infelicium abstineret: Satis superque sufficere, ut episcopali sententiâ hæretici judicati Ecclesiis pellerentur.

the author of it, refusing to admit Ithacius, the sanguinary bishop, to their communion. So great a concern had those holy men to keep within the bounds of their spiritual jurisdiction!

SECT. 5.—An Account of the Literæ Formatæ, and the Bishops Prerogative in granting them to all Persons.

And it may be observed, that the authority of bishops was never greater in the world, than when they concerned themselves only in the exercise of their own proper spiritual power. For then they had an universal respect paid them by all sorts of men; insomuch that no Christian would pretend to travel, without taking letters of credence with him from his own bishop, if he meant to communicate with the Christian Church in a foreign country. Such was the admirable unity of the Church Catholic in those days, and the blessed harmony and consent of her bishops among one another! These letters were of divers sorts, according to the different occasions or quality of the persons, that carried them. They are generally reduced to three kinds—the *Epistolæ Commendatoriæ*, *Communicatoriæ*, and *Dimissoriæ*. The first were such as were granted only to persons of quality, or else persons, whose reputation had been called in question, or to the clergy, who had occasion to travel into foreign countries. The second sort were granted to all, who were in the peace and communion of the Church; whence they were also called *Pacificæ*, and *Ecclesiasticæ*, and sometimes *Canonicæ*. The third sort were such as were only given to the clergy, when they were to remove from their own diocese, and settle in another; and they were to testify, that they had their bishop's leave to depart; whence they were called *Dimissoriæ*, and sometimes *Pacificæ* likewise. All these went under the general name of *Formatæ*, because they were written in a peculiar form, with some particular marks and characters, which served as special signatures to distinguish them from counterfeits. I shall not stand now to give any further account of them here, but only observe, that it was the bishop's sole prerogative to grant them; and none might presume to do it, at least without his authority and commission. The council of

Antioch[1] allows country bishops to write them, but expressly forbids presbyters the privilege. And whereas in times of persecution, some confessors, who were of great esteem in the Church, would take upon them to grant such letters by their own authority, and in their own names; the councils of Arles[2] and Eliberis,[3] forbade them to do it; and ordered all persons, who had such letters, to take new communicatory letters from the bishop. Baronius[4] and the common editors of the Councils, who follow him, mistake these letters for the libels, which the confessors were used to grant to the *Lapsi*, to have them admitted into the communion of the Church again. But Albaspiny[5] corrects this mistake; and rightly observes, that those councils speak not of such libels as were given to the *Lapsi*, but of such as were given to all Christians, who had occasion to travel into foreign countries; which it belonged to the bishops to grant, and not to the confessors, whatever authority they might otherwise have obtained by their honourable confession of Christ in time of persecution. The council of Eliberis[6] takes notice of another abuse of this nature, and corrects it; which was, that some women of famous renown in the Church, clergymen's wives, as Albaspiny thinks, or rather the wives of bishops, would presume both to grant and receive such letters by their own authority; all which the Council orders to be sunk, as being dangerous to the discipline and communion of the Church, and an encroachment upon the bishop's power, to whom alone it belonged to grant them. For, by all ancient canons, this privilege is reserved entirely to bishops, and this set their authority very high in the Church; for no one, either clergy or laity, could communicate in any church beside his own, without these testimonials from his bishop, as may be seen in the councils of Carthage,[7] and Agde,[8] and many others.

---

[1] Con. Antioch. can. 8. [2] Con. Arelat. i. c. 9. De his, qui confessorum literas offerunt, placuit, ut sublatis eis literis, alias accipiant communicatorias. [3] Con. Elib. c. 25. [4] Baron. an. 142. Loaysa Not. in Con. Elib. c. 25. [5] Albasp. Not. in Con. Elib. c. 25. [6] Con. Elib. c. 81. [7] Con. Carth. i. can. 7. Clericus vel Laicus non communicet in alienâ plebe sine literis episcopi sui. [8] Agath. can. 52. Epaun. c. 6. Laodic. c. 41. Milevit. c. 20. Con. Antioch. c. 7.

SECT. 6.—Of the Bishop's Power in disposing of the Revenues of the Church.

I have but one thing more to observe concerning the power of bishops over the Church; and that is, their authority and concern in disposing of the revenues of the Church. I intend not here to enter upon the discourse of ecclesiastical revenues, (which has its proper place in this work hereafter) but only to suggest now, that it was part of the bishop's office and care, to see them managed and disposed of to the best advantage. The councils of Antioch,[1] and Gangra,[2] have several canons to this purpose; that all the incomes and oblations of the Church shall be dispensed at the will and discretion of the bishop, to whom the people, and the souls of men, are committed. Those called the Apostolical[3] Canons and Constitutions,[4] speak of the same power. And Cyprian[5] notes, that all, who received maintenance from the Church, had it, *Episcopo dispensante, by the order and appointment of the bishop.* He did not indeed always dispense with his own hands, but by proper assistants, such as his archdeacon, and the *Œconomus,* which some canons[6] order to be one of the clergy of every church; but these officers were only stewards under him, both of his appointing, as St. Jerom[7] observes, and also accountable to him, as the supreme governor of the Church. Whence Possidius takes notice of the practice of St. Austin; that though neither seal nor key was ever seen in his hand, but some of his clergy were always his administrators, yet he had his certain times to audit their accounts; so that all was still his act, though administered and dispensed by the hands of others. And this was agreeable to the primitive rule and practice of the Apostles, to whose care and custody the people's oblations, and things consecrated to God, were committed; they chose deacons to be their assistants, as bishops did afterwards, still retaining power in their own hands to direct and regulate them in the disposal of the public charity, as prime stewards of God's revenue, and chief masters of His household.

---

[1] Con. Antioch, c. 24 et 25. [2] Con. Gangr. c. 7 et 8. [3] Canon. Apost. c. 31 et 38. [4] Constit. Apostol. lib. ii. c. 25. [5] Cypr. Ep. xxxviii. al. 41. Just. Mart. Apol. 2. [6] Con. Chalced. c. 26. [7] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. Sciat episcopus, cui commissa est Ecclesia, quem dispensationi pauperum, curæque præficiat.

CHAP. V.

Of the Office of Bishops, in Relation to the whole Catholic Church.

SECT. I.—In what sense every Bishop supposed to be Bishop of the whole Catholic Church.

WE have hitherto considered the office and power of bishops over the clergy and people of their own particular Churches. But there is yet a more eminent branch of their pastoral office and care behind, which is, their superintendency over the whole Catholic Church, in which every bishop was supposed to have an equal share; not as to what concerned external polity and government, but the prime essential part of religion, the preservation of the Christian faith. Whenever the faith was in danger of being subverted by heresy, or destroyed by persecution, then every bishop thought it part of his duty and office to put to his helping hand, and labour as much for any other diocese as his own. Dioceses were but limits of convenience, for the preservation of order in times of peace. But the faith was a more universal thing, and when war was made upon that, then the whole world was but one diocese, and the whole Church but one flock; and every pastor thought himself obliged to feed his great Master's sheep, according to his power, whatever part of the world they were scattered in. In this sense, every bishop was an universal pastor, and bishop of the whole world; as having a common care and concern for the whole Church of Christ. This is what St. Austin[1] told Boniface, bishop of Rome, "that the pastoral care was common to all those, who had the office of bishop, and though he was a little higher advanced toward the top of Christ's watch-tower, yet all others

[1] Aug. cont. Epist. Pelag. in præfat. ad Bonifac. Communis est nobis omnibus, qui fungimur Episcopatûs officio (quamvis ipse in eo celsiore fastigio præmineas) Speccula Pastoralis.

ı equal concern in it." St. Cyprian testifies[1] for the ce of his own time, "that all bishops were so united ı body, that if any of the body broached any heresy, gan to lay waste and tear the flock of Christ, all the mmediately came in to its rescue; for though they many pastors, yet they had but one flock to feed; very one was obliged to take care of all the sheep of t, which he had purchased with his blood." In this , Gregory Nazianzen[2] says of Cyprian, "that he was niversal bishop, that he presided not only over the ch of Carthage and Afric, but over all the regions of vest, and over the east, and south, and northern of the world also." He says the same of Athanasius,[3] , in being made bishop of Alexandria, he was made p of the whole world," which agrees with St. Basil's vation[4] concerning him, "That he had the care of all ches, as much as that, which was peculiarly committed m." Chrysostom[5] in like manner styles Timothy, ıop of the universe," and in compliance with this ımary character, the author under the name of Clemens anus,[6] gives St. James bishop of Jerusalem, the title of, vernor of all Churches," as well as that of Jerusalem. sostom[7] says, "St. Paul had the whole world com- ıd to his care, and every city under the sun; that he the teacher[8] of the universe, and presided[9] over all rches;" which he repeats in many places of his writings.

---

ypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Steph. p. 178. Idcirco copiosum corpus est dotum, concordiæ mutuæ glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si ıx Collegio nostro Hæresin facere, et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare rerit, subveniant cœteri. - - -Nam etsi pastores multi sumus, unum tamen ıs pascimus, et oves universas, quas Christus sanguine suo et passione ıvit, colligere et fovere debemus. [2] Greg. Naz. Orat. 18. ad. Cypr. [3] Naz. in Laud. Athan. Or. xxi. p. 377. τῆς ίνης πάσης ἐπιτασίαν πιστεύεται. [4] Basil. ep. 52. ad Athanas. ys. Hom. 6. adv. Jud. t. i. p. 542. τὴν τῆς οἰκουμένης προστασίαν ἐγκε- ιμένος. [6] Pseudo-Clem. Ep. ad Jacob. ap. Coteler. Patr. Apost. t. 511. Clemens Jacobo- - - -regenti Hebræorum sanctam Ecclesiam in ıosolymis; sed et omnes Ecclesias, quæ ubique Dei Providentiâ fundatæ [7] Chrys. Hom. 17. in illud, Salutate Priscillam. t. v. ıl. τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν ἐγκεχειρισμένος, &c. [8] Id Hom. 6. erræmotum et Lazar. t. v. p. 107. τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος. Hom. 17. in Pricillam. p. 248.

Nor was this prerogative so peculiar to the Apostles, but that every bishop (in some measure) had a right and title to the same character.

SECT. 2.—In what Respect the whole World but one Diocese, and but one Bishopric in the Church.

Hence came that current notion, so frequently to be met with in Cyprian, of but one bishopric in the Church; wherein every single bishop had his share in such a manner, as to have an equal concern in the whole; "*Episcopatus unus est, cujus à singulis in solidum pars tenetur,*"[1] *there is but one bishopric in the Church, and every bishop has an undivided portion in it.* He does not say, it was a monarchy, in the hands of any single bishop, but a diffusive power, that lay in the whole college of bishops,[2] every one of which had a title to feed the whole Church of God, and drive away heresy out of any part of it. In this sense, the bishop of Eugubium's power extended as far as the bishop of Rome's; the bishop of Rhegium was as much bishop of the whole Church, as Constantinople, and Tanis equal to Alexandria; for in St. Jerome's[3] language, they were all *Ejusdem Meriti*, and *ejusdem Sacerdotii, of the same merit, and equal in their priesthood,* which was but one. In things, that did not appertain to the faith, they were not to meddle with other men's dioceses, but only to mind the business of their own; but when the faith or welfare of the Church lay at stake, and religion was manifestly invaded, then, by this rule of there being but one episcopacy, every other bishopric was as much their diocese as their own; and no human laws or canons, could tie up their hands from performing such acts of their episcopal office in any part of the world, as they thought necessary for the preservation of religion.

---

[1] Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. p. 108. [2] Id. Ep. lii. al. lv. ad Antonian. p. 112. Episcopatus unus Episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus, &c. In the same epistle, he often mentions the Collegium Sacerdotale. It. Epist. 59. et 68. [3] Hieron. ep. 85. ad. Evagr.

Sect. 3.—Some particular Instances of Private Bishops acting as Bishops of the whole Universal Church.

For the better understanding the Church's practice in this point, I shall illustrate it in two or three particular instances. It was a rule in the primitive Church, that no bishop should ordain in another's diocese, without his leave; and though this was a sort of confinement of the episcopal power to a single diocese, yet for order's sake it was generally observed. But then it might happen, that in some cases there might be a necessity to do otherwise; as in case the bishop of any diocese was turned heretic, and would ordain none but heretical clergy, and persecute and drive away the orthodox. In that case, any catholic bishop, as being a bishop of the universal Church, was authorized to ordain orthodox men in such a diocese, though contrary to the common rule; because this was evidently for the preservation of the faith, which is the supreme rule of all, and therefore that other rule must give way to this superior obligation. Upon this account, when the Church was in danger of being overrun with Arianism, the great Athanasius, as he returned from his exile, made no scruple to ordain in several cities[1] as he went along, though they were not in his own diocese. And the famous Eusebius, of Samosata, did the like in the times of the Arian persecution under Valens. Theodoret[2] says, "He went about all Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, in a soldier's habit, ordaining presbyters and deacons, and setting in order whatever he found wanting in the Churches." He ordained bishops also in Syria and Cilicia, and other places, whose names Theodoret[3] has recorded. Now all this was contrary to the common rules, but the necessity of the Church required it; and that gave them authority in such a case to exert their power, and act as bishops of the whole Catholic Church. Epiphanius made use of the same power and privilege in a like case, ordaining Paulinianus, St. Jerom's brother, first deacon, and then presbyter, in a monastery out of his own diocese in Palestine; against which, when some

[1] Socrat. lib. ii. c. 24. [2] Theod. lib. iv. c. 13. [3] Theod. lib. v. c. 4.

of his adversaries objected, that it was done contrary to canon, he vindicated[1] his practice upon the strength of this principle; that in cases of pressing necessity, such as this was, where the interest of God was to be served, every bishop had power to act in any part of the Church. For though all bishops had their particular Churches to officiate in, and were not ordinarily to exceed their own bounds, yet the love of Christ was a rule above all; and therefore men were not barely to consider the thing, that was done, but the circumstances of the action, the time, the manner, the persons for whose sake, and the end for which it was done. Thus Epiphanius apoligizes for the exercise of his episcopal power, in the diocese of another man. Now from all this it appears, that every bishop was as much an universal bishop, and had as much the care of the whole Church, as the bishop of Rome himself; there being no acts of the episcopal office, which they could not perform in any part of the world, when need required, without a dispensation, as well as he. All that he enjoyed above others, was only the rights of a metropolitan, or a patriarch, and those confined by the canons to a certain district;—of which more hereafter in their proper place.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Independency of Bishops, especially in the Cyprianic Age, and in the African Churches.

SECT. 1.—What meant by the Independency of Bishops one of another, and their absolute Power in their own Church.

THERE is one thing more must be taken notice of, whilst we are considering the proper office of bishops, which is

[1] Epiphan. Ep. ad Joan. Hierosol. Ob Dei timorem hoc summe facere compulsi: Maximè cùm nulla sit diversitas in sacerdotio Dei, et ubi utilitati Dei providetur. Nam etsi singuli Ecclesiarum Episcopi habent sub se Ecclesias, quibus curam videntur impendere, et nemo super alienam mensuram extenditur; tamen præponitur omnibus charitas Christi, in quâ nulla simulatio est: nec considerandum quid factum sit, sed quo tempore, et quo modo, et in quibus, et quare factum sit.

he absolute power of every bishop in his own Church, ndependent of all others. For the right understanding the ast limits of this power, we are to distinguish between the ubstantial and the ritual part of religion. For it was in he latter chiefly that bishops had an absolute power in their wn Church, being at liberty to use what indifferent rites hey thought fit in their own Church, without being accountable for their practice to any other. In matters of ith indeed, when they corrupted the truth by heretical octrines, or introduced any rituals, that were destructive f it, they were obnoxious to the censure of all other bishops; nd every individual of the whole catholic college of bishops as has been noted in the last chapter) was authorized to ppose them. But in such indifferent rites, as were lawful to e used in the Church, every bishop was allowed to choose or himself, and his own Church, such as he thought fit and xpedient in his own wisdom and discretion.

SECT. 2.—All Bishops had Liberty to form their own Liturgies.

Thus, for instance, though there was but one form of vorship throughout the whole Church, as to what concerned he substance of Christian worship, yet every bishop was t liberty to form his own liturgy, in what method and words e thought proper, only keeping to the analogy of faith nd sound doctrine. Thus Gregory Nazianzen observes of St. Basil, "That, among other good services which he did or the Church of Cæsarea, whilst he was but a presbyter n it, one was[1] the composing of forms of prayer, which, by he consent and authority of his bishop, Eusebius, were used y the Church." And this is thought, not improbably by ome,[2] to be the first draught of that liturgy, which bears his ame to this day. The Church of Neo-Cæsarea in Pontus, where St. Basil was born, had a liturgy peculiar to themelves, which St. Basil[3] speaks of in one of his epistles. Chrysostom's liturgy, which he composed for the Church of Constanstinople, differed from these. The Ambrosian form

[1] Naz. Orat. xx. in Laud. Basil. p. 340. ἐυχῶν διατάξεις, καὶ ευκοσμίας τοῦ ἁγίματος. [2] Billius Not. in Loc. Cave Hist. Liter. vol. i. p. 194. Basil. Ep. 63. ad Neocæsar.

differed from the Roman, and the Roman from others. The Africans had peculiar forms of their own, differing from the Roman, as appears from some passages cited by Victorinus Afer and Fulgentius, out of the African liturgies, which Cardinal Bona[1] owns are not to be found in the Roman.

SECT. 3.—And express the same Creed in different Forms.

The like observation may be made upon the creeds used in divers Churches. There was but one rule of faith, as Tertullian[2] calls it, and that fixed and unalterable, as to the substance, throughout the whole Church. Yet there were different ways of expressing it, as appears from the several forms still extant, which differ something from one another. Those in[3] Irenæus, in[4] Cyprian, and Tertullian,[5] are not exactly in the same method nor form of words. The creed of Eusebius[6] and his Church of Cæsarea differed from that of Jerusalem, upon which Cyril[7] comments; and that of Cyril's from that in St. James's[8] liturgy. And to omit abundance more, that might be here mentioned, the creed of Aquileia, recited by Ruffin,[9] differs from the Roman creed, which is that we commonly call the Apostle's creed. Now the reason of all this difference could be no other but this, that all bishops had power to frame the creeds of their own Churches, and express them in such terms as suited best their own convenience, and to meet with the heresies they were most in danger from. As Ruffin, observes that the words, invisible and impassible, were added to the first article in the creed of Aquileia, in opposition to the Patripassian or Sabellian heretics, who asserted "that the Father was visible and passible in human flesh, as well as the Son." And it is evident the bishops of other Churches used the same liberty, as they saw occasion.

---

[1] Bona Rer. Liturgic. lib. i. c. 7. n. 3. [2] Tertul. de Veland. Virg. c. 1. Regula Fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, &c.
[3] Iren. lib. i. c. 2. [4] Cypr. Ep. lxx. ad Episc. Numid. p. 190. It. Ep. lxxvi. al. lxix. ad Magnum. p. 183. ed. Oxon. [5] Tertul. Ibid.
[6] Euseb. Ep. ad Cæsariens. ap. Socrat. lib. i. c. 8. [7] Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. 4. [8] Liturg. Jacobi. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. tom. ii. p. 7.
[9] Ruffin. in Symbol. Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Invisibilem et Impassibilem.

:T. 4.—And appoint particular Days of Fasting in their own Churches.

were easy to confirm this observation, by many other ances of the like nature; but I shall only name one e; which is, the power every bishop had to appoint par- lar days of fasting in his own Church. This we learn ı St. Austin's answer to Casulanus about the Saturday-

Casulanus was very much troubled and perplexed nt it, because he observed in Afric some Churches keep fast, and others a festival; nay, sometimes in the same rch, men were divided in their practice, and one part d on that day, whilst another fasted. Now, to remove ulanus's scruple, St. Austin gives him[1] this answer: hat the best way in this case, was to follow those who e the rulers of every Church; therefore, if he would his advice, he should never resist his bishop in this ter, but do as he did, without doubt or scruple;" which nly implies, that it was then in every bishop's power to er, or not order, this fast in his own Church, as he saw it convenient.

CT. 5.—The Independency of Bishops most conspicuous in the African Churches.

and indeed these privileges of bishops, and their abso- and independent power in all such matters, were no ere more fully reserved to them, than in the African irches, from the time of Cyprian, who frequently makes ption of this independent power, which extended not y to mere rituals, but to several momentous points of cipline;—such as the case of re-baptizing heretics, ad- ting adulterers to the communion of the Church again, the question about the validity of clinic baptism. In se points, Cyprian's opinion and practice differed from ers of his fellow-bishops: but yet he assumed no power censuring those, that acted differently from what he did, separated from their communion upon it; but left every to give an account of his own practice to God, the

---

Aug. Ep. lxxxvi. ad Casulan. Mos eorum mihi sequendus videtur, quibus m populorum congregatio regenda commissa est. Quapropter si con- meo acquiescis: Episcopo tuo in hâc re noli resistere, et quod facit ipse, ullo scrupulo vel disceptatione sectare.

Judge of all. For the case of re-baptizing such as were baptized by heretics, he was entirely for it, as is sufficiently known to all: but he was not so zealous for it, as to exercise any judicial power of deposing or excommunicating those who practised otherwise, but declares, he left every bishop to his liberty to act according to his judgment, and answer for what he did to God alone. To this purpose he expresses himself in his letter to Pope Stephen,[1] and that to Jubaianus,[2] but most fully in his speech delivered at the opening of the great council of Carthage, which met to consider this very question. "Let us every one now," says he, "give our opinion of this matter,[3] judging no man, nor repelling any from our communion, that shall think otherwise; for no one of us makes himself bishop of bishops, or compels his colleagues, by tyrannical terror, to a necessity of complying; forasmuch as every bishop, according to the liberty and power that is granted him, is free to act as he sees fit, and can no more be judged by others, than he can judge them. But let us all expect the judgment of our Lord, Jesus Christ, who only hath power both to invest us with the government of his Church, and to pass sentence upon our actions." Thus far Cyprian, in full and open council, declares for the independent power of every bishop, tacitly reflecting upon the bishop of Rome, who pretended to excommunicate those, who differed in opinion and practice from him, which Cyprian condemns, as a tyrannical way of proceeding.

For the next point, that is, the case of admitting adulterers

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. lxxii. ad Steph. p. 197. Quâ in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus, cum habeat in Ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque Præpositus, rationem actûs sui Domino redditurus. [2] Ep. lxxiii. ad Jubaian. p. 210. [3] Con. Carth. ap. Cypr. p. 229. Superest ut de hâc ipsâ re singuli quid sentiamus, proferamus; neminem judicantes, aut à jure communionis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrûm Episcopum se Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentio libertatis et potestatis suæ, arbitrium proprium; tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quàm nec ipse potest judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et præponendi nos in Ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi.

to communion again, Cyprian says his predecessors in Afric were divided upon the question; but they did not divide communion upon it: for though some bishops admitted adulterers to penance, and others refused to do it, yet they did not censure each other's practice, but preserved peace and concord among themselves,[1] leaving every one to answer to God for his actions. I know, indeed, some learned persons[2] interpret this liberty of the African bishops so as to make it mean no more than a liberty to follow their own judgment, till such times as the Church should determine the matter in dispute, by making some public decree about it. But I must own, I cannot but think Cyprian meant something more, because he pleads for the same liberty, even after the decrees of a plenary council, as we have seen in his preface to the Council of Carthage.

As to the third question, about the validity of clinic baptism, that is, whether persons who were only sprinkled with water in their beds, in time of sickness, and not immersed or washed all over the body in baptism, were to be looked upon as complete Christians—Cyprian, for his own part, resolves it in the affirmative; but yet, if any bishops were otherwise persuaded, that it was not lawful baptism, and upon that ground gave such persons a new immersion, he professes[3] that he prescribes to none, but leaves every one to act according to his own judgment and discretion. This was that ancient liberty of the Cyprianic age, of which I have discoursed a little more particularly in this place, because it shows us what was then the uncontested power and privilege of every bishop in the African Church, which is not so commonly understood in these latter ages.

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. lii. al. lv. ad Antonian. p. 110. [2] Bishop Fell, Not. in Loc. citat. [3] Cypr. Ep. lxxvi. al. lxix. ad Magnum. p. 186. Quâ in parte nemini verecundia et modestia nostra præjudicat, quo minus unusquisque, quod putat, sentiat, et quod senserit, faciat. It. p. 188. Nemini præscribentes, quo minus statuat quod putat unusquisque Præpositus; actûs sui rationem Domino redditurus.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Power of Bishops in Hearing and Determining Secular Causes.

Sect. 1.—Bishops commonly chosen Arbitrators of Men's Differences in the Primitive Church.

We have hitherto considered such offices of the episcopal function, as belonged to all bishops by the laws of God, and the canons of the Church. Besides these there was one office more, imposed upon them by custom and the laws of the state; which was the hearing and determining secular causes, upon the continual applications and addresses that people made to them. For such was the singular character and repute of bishops, and such the entire confidence men generally reposed in them for their integrity and justice, that they were commonly appealed to, as the best arbitrators of men's differences, and the most impartial judges of the common disputes that happened among them. Sidonius Apollinaris[1] often refers to this custom; and Synesius calls it[2] part of his own episcopal office and function. St. Ambrose testifies for himself[3] that he was used to be appealed to upon such occasions; and St. Austin[4] says of him, "that he was often so much employed in hearing causes, that he had scarce time for other business." And this was St. Austin's case also, who frequently complains of the burthen[5] that lay upon him in this respect: for not only Christians, but men of all sects applied to him; insomuch that as Possidius[6] notes in his life, he often spent all the morning, and sometimes the whole day, fasting and hearing their causes; which though it was a great fatigue to him, yet he was willing to bear it, because it gave him frequent opportunities of instilling the principles of truth and virtue into the minds of the parties that applied themselves to him.

---

[1] Sidon. lib. iii. ep. 12. lib. vi. ep. 2 et 4. [2] Synes. ep. cv. p. 300. [3] Ambros. ep. 24. ad Marcellum. [4] Aug. Confess. lib. vi. c. 3. [5] Aug. ep. 110 et 147. It. de Opere Monach. c. 29. [6] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 19.

SECT. 2.—The Original of this Custom. What meant by the Word ἐξουθενημένοι in St. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 4.

And it is to be observed, that though there be no express text in the New Testament, that commands bishops to be judges in secular causes; yet St. Austin was of opinion, that St. Paul, in prohibiting men to go to law before the unbelievers, did virtually lay this obligation upon them: for he says, once and again,[1] that it was the Apostle that instituted ecclesiastical judges, and laid the burthen of secular causes upon them. By which he means, that the Apostle gave a general direction to Christians to choose arbitrators among themselves. And that custom determined this office particularly to the bishops, as the best qualified by their wisdom and probity to discharge it. And this is very agreeable to St. Paul's meaning, 1 Cor. vi. 4. as some very learned and judicious critics[2] understand him; for though all the common translations render the words, ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, *persons that are least esteemed in the Church*; yet Dr. Lightfoot observes, "that they may as well signify persons of the greatest esteem," for the original word, ἐξουθενημένοι, signifies only private judges, or arbitrators of men's own choosing; such as were in use among the Jews, who called them ἰδιῶται, and *non-authentici*, not because they were of the meanest and most contemptible of the people, but because they were the lowest rank of judges, and not settled as a standing court by the Sanhedrim, but chosen by the litigants themselves to arbitrate their causes. Such private judges the Apostle directs the Christians to choose in the Church, and refer their controversies to them; which is not any injunction to choose judges out of the poorest and meanest and most ignorant of the people, but rather the contrary, persons that were well qualified by their wisdom and authority to take upon them to be judges, and end controversies among their

[1] Aug. Ser. xxiv. in Psal. 118. Constituit talibus causis ecclesiasticos Apostolus cognitores, in foro prohibens jurgare Christianos. Id. de Oper. Monach. c. 29. Quibus nos molestiis affixit Apostolus, &c. [2] Lightfoot. and Lud. de Dieu in 1 Cor. vi. 4.

brethren. Now because none were thought better qualified in these respects than bishops, the office of judging upon that account was commonly imposed upon them, and they in decency and charity could not well refuse it. This seems to be the true original of this part of the episcopal office and function.

SECT. 3.—This Power of Bishops confirmed by the Imperial Laws.

But what was thus begun by custom, while the civil governors were heathens, was afterwards confirmed and established by law, when the emperors became Christians. Eusebius[1] says, "Constantine made a law to confirm all such decisions of bishops in their consistories, and that no secular judges should have any power to reverse or disannul them; forasmuch as the priests of God were to be preferred before any other judge." And Sozomen[2] adds, "that he gave leave to all litigants to refer their causes to the determination of bishops, whose sentence should stand good, and be as authentic as if it had been the decision of the emperor himself; and that the governors of every province and their officers should be obliged to put their decrees in execution." There is a law now added at the end of the Theodosian Code, which some take for this very law of Constantine, mentioned by these authors. Selden himself reckons[3] it a genuine piece; but I think Gothofred's arguments are stronger to prove it spurious. For it grants bishops such a power, as neither Eusebius nor Sozomen mention, and all other laws contradict:—viz. that if either of the contending parties, the possessor[4] or the plaintiff, was minded to bring the cause before a bishop, either when it was before a secular court, or when it was determined, he might do it, though the other party was against it. Whereas all laws and

---

[1] Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. iv. c. 27.
[2] Sozom. lib. i. c. 9.
[3] Selden Uxor. Hebr. lib. iii. c. 28. p. 564.
[4] Extravag. de Elect. Judicii Episcop. ad Calcem Cod. Theod. tom. iv. p. 303. Quicunque litem habens, sive possessor, sive petitor erit, inter initia litis, vel decursis temporum curriculis, sive cum negotium peroratur, sive cum jam cœperit promi sententia, judicium eligit sacrosanctæ legis Antistitis, illico sine aliquâ dubitatione, etiamsi alia pars refragatur, ad Episcopum cum sermone litigantium dirigatur. Vid. Gothofred. Comment. in Loc.

ory are against this practice; for no cause was to be ught before a bishop, except both parties agreed by way ompromise to take him for their arbitrator. In this e the bishop's sentence was valid, and to be executed by secular power, but not otherwise. So that either this s not the genuine law of Constantine, to which Eusebius l Sozomen refer, or else it was revoked and contradicted all others. Gothofred produces a great many contrary s; I shall content myself with a single instance.

r. 4.—Yet not allowed in Criminal Causes; nor in any Causes, but when the Litigants both agreed to take them for Arbitrators.

In the Justinian Code[1] we have two laws of the emperors cadius and Honorius, about the same matter, which may ve to explain the law of Constantine; for there any hops are allowed to judge, and their judgment is or- red to be final, so as no appeal should be made from it; d the officers of the secular judges are appointed to exe- te the bishop's sentence. But then there are these two itations expressly put; 1st, that they shall only have wer to judge, when both parties agree by consent to refer eir causes to their arbitration. And, 2dly, where the uses are purely civil, and not criminal causes, where rhaps life and death might be concerned; for in such uses the clergy were prohibited by the Canons[2] of the urch, as well as the laws of the state, from being con- rned as judges: therefore bishops never suffered any cri- inal causes to come before them, except such as were to punished with ecclesiastical censures.

ar. 5.—Bishops sometimes made their Presbyters, and sometimes Laymen, their Substitutes in this Affair.

But they had commonly civil causes more than enough

---

[1] Cod. Justin. lib. 1. Tit. 4. Leg. 7. Si qui ex consensu apud sacræ legis ntistitem litigare voluerint, non vetabuntur. Sed experientur illius in civili ntaxat negotio, more arbitri sponte residentis judicium. Ibid. Leg. 8. piscopale judicium ratum sit omnibus, qui se audiri à sacerdotibus elege- nt; eamque eorum judicationi adhibendam esse reverentiam jubemus, tum vestris deferri necesse est potestatibus, à quibus non licet provocare, c. [2] Concil. Tarracon. can. 4. Habeant licentiam judicandi, ex- ptis criminalibus negotiis.

flowing in upon them; so that they were forced sometimes to let part of this care devolve upon some other person, whose integrity and prudence they could confide in. This was commonly one of their clergy, a presbyter or a principal deacon. St. Austin, when he found the burthen of this affair begin to press too hard upon him, substituted Eradius, his presbyter,[1] in his room. And the council of Taragone speaks not only of presbyters but[2] deacons also, who were deputed to hear secular causes. And Socrates says,[3] "Sylvanus, bishop of Troas, took the power wholly out of the hands of his clergy, because he had found some of them faulty in making an unlawful gain of the causes that were brought before them; for which reason he never deputed any one of them to be judge, but made some laymen his delegate, whom he knew to be a man of integrity, and strict lover of justice." I leave the learned to inquire, whether lay chancellors in the Church had not their first rise and original from some such occasion as this, whilst bishops deputed laymen to hear secular causes in their name, still reserving the proper spiritual and ecclesiastical power entirely to themselves.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Privilege of Bishops to intercede for Criminals.

SECT. 1.—Of the great Power and Interest of Bishops in Interceding to the Secular Magistrates.

I have observed in the foregoing chapter, that bishops were never allowed to be judges in capital or criminal causes, because they were not to be concerned in blood. They were to be so far from having any thing to do in the death of any man, that custom made it almost a piece of their office and duty to save men from death, by interceding to the secular magistrates for criminals that were condemned

[1] Aug. Ep. 110.

[2] Con. Tarracon. c. 4. Nullus episcoporum, presbyterorum, vel clericorum, Die Dominico propositum cujuscunque causæ negotium audeat judicare.

[3] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 37.

, die. St. Ambrose often made use of this privilege, as e author of his life, observes frequently addressing himself to Macedonius[1] and Stilico,[2] and other great ministers f the age, in behalf of poor delinquents, to obtain pardon r them. St. Austin did the same for the Circumcellions, hen they were convicted and condemned for murdering me of the catholic clergy; he wrote two pathetic letters[3] the African magistrates, Marcellinus Comes and Aprinius, desiring that their lives might be spared, and that they ight only be punished with close custody and confinement, here they might be set to work, and have time allowed them r repentance. The council[4] of Sardica seems to speak of as the duty of all bishops to intercede for such as imlored the mercy of the Church when they were condemned o be transported or banished, or any the like punishment. And the custom was become so general, that it began to e considered as a condition in the election of a bishop, whether he were qualified to discharge this part of his ffice as well as others. Sidonius Apollinaris[5] instances in uch a case, where it was made an objection by the people against the election of a certain bishop, that being a man of a monkish and retired life, he was fitter to be an bbot than a bishop: "he might intercede," they said, "indeed with the Heavenly Judge for their souls, but he was not qualified to intercede with the earthly judges for their bodies." He was not a man of address, which they then thought necessary to discharge this part of the office of a bishop. They might perhaps judge wrong, as those in St. Jerom[6] did, who pretended that clergymen ought to give splendid entertainments to the secular judges, that they might gain an interest in them; whom St. Jerom justly reproves, telling them, that any judge would pay a greater reverence to a pious and sober clergyman, than to a wealthy

---

[1] Paulin. vit. Ambros. p. 8. [2] Ibid. p. 12. [3] Aug. Ep. 159 et 160. [4] Con. Sardic can. 7. [5] Sidon. lib. vii. ep. 9. p. 448. Hic qui nominatur, inquiunt, non Episcopi, sed potius Abbatis complet officium: et intercedere magis pro animabus apud Cœlestem, quàm pro corporibus apud terrenum Judicem potest. [6] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. p. 15. Quod si obtenderis te facere hæc, ut roges pro miseris atque subjectis; judex sæculi plus deferet clerico continenti, quàm diviti, et magis sanctitatem tuam venerabitur, quàm opes.

one, and would respect him more for his holiness than his riches. However this shews what was then the common custom, and how great an interest bishops generally had in the secular magistrate, who seldom rejected any petitions of this nature. Socrates notes, that even some of the Novatian bishops enjoyed this privilege, as Paulus[2] of Constantinople, and Leontius[1] of Rome, at whose intercession Theodosius the Emperor pardoned Symmachus, who had been guilty of treason, in making a panegyric upon Maximus the tyrant, but was, after his death, fled for sanctuary to a Christian Church.

SECT. 2.—The Reasons why Bishops interceded for some Criminals and not others.

We may here observe that crimes in themselves of a very heinous nature, such as treason and murder, were sometimes pardoned at their request; but we are not to imagine that bishops at any time turned patrons for criminals, to the obstruction of public justice, (which would have been to have cut the sinews of government) but only in such cases, where pardon would manifestly be for the benefit and honour both of the Church and Commonwealth; or else where the crimes themselves had some such alleviating circumstances, as might incline a compassionate judge to grant a pardon. As when St. Ambrose interceded with Stilico for the pardon of some poor deluded wretches, whom Stilico's own servant, by forgery, had drawn into an error; their ignorance might reasonably be pleaded in their behalf. And when St. Austin petitioned for favour to be showed to the Circumcellions, it was, he thought, for the honour of the Church, to free her from the suspicion and charge of revenge and cruelty, which the Donatists were so ready to cast upon her; and therefore he desired Apringius,[3] the proconsul, to spare them for the sake of Christ and his Church, as well as to give them time to see their error and repent of it.

---

[1] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 17. [2] Id. lib. v. cap. 14. [3] Aug. Ep. 160. Illi impio ferro fuderunt sanguinem Christianum: Tu ab eorum sanguine etiam juridicum gladium cohibe propter Christum.——Tu inimicis Ecclesiæ viventibus relaxa spatium pœnitendi.

SECT. 3.—They never interceded in Civil Matters and Pecuniary Causes.

It must further be noted from St. Ambrose, that bishops, though they themselves were sometimes chosen judges in civil causes, yet never interceded for any man in such causes to the secular judges. And he gives a very good reason[1] for it; because, in pecuniary causes, where two parties are concerned, a bishop could not intercede for one party, but the other would be injured, and have reason to think he lost his cause by the interest and favour of the intercessor inclining to the adverse party; for which reason, there are no examples of their interceding in such cases.

CHAP. IX.

Of some particular Honours and Instances of Respect showed to Bishops by all Persons in general.

SECT. 1.—Of the ancient Custom of bowing the Head, to receive the Benediction of Bishops.

THERE are several other privileges belonging to bishops, in common with the rest of the clergy; such as their exemption from burdensome offices, and some sort of taxes, and the cognizance of the secular courts in some cases; of which I shall say nothing particularly here, because they will be considered when we treat of the privileges of the clergy in general. But there are two or three customs, which argued a particular respect paid to bishops, and therefore I must not here wholly pass them over. One of these was the ancient custom of bowing the head before them, to receive their blessing,—a custom so universally prevailing, that the emperors themselves did not refuse to comply with it; as may appear from that discourse of Hilary[2] to Constantius, where he tells him, "he entertained the bishops with a kiss, with which Christ was betrayed; and bowed his head to

[1] Ambros. de Offic. lib. iii. c. 9. In causis pecuniariis intervenire non est Sacerdotis, &c. [2] Hilar. adv. Constant. p. 95. Osculo Sacerdotes excipis, quo et Christus est proditus: caput benedictioni summittis, ut fidem calces.

receive their benediction, whilst he trampled on their faith." This plainly refers to the custom we are speaking of. And by it we may understand the meaning of Theodoret, when he says,[1] "The emperor Valentinian gave orders to the bishops, who were met, to make choice of a bishop of Milan, 'That they should place such an one on the bishop's throne, of that eminency for life and doctrine, that the emperors themselves might not be ashamed to bow their heads to him.'" The same custom is more plainly hinted at by St. Chrysostom, in one of his homilies[2] to the people of Antioch; where, speaking of Flavian, their bishop, who was gone to the emperor to procure a pardon for them, he says, "Flavian was a prince, and a more honourable prince than the other; forasmuch as the sacred laws made the emperor submit his head to the hands of the bishop." He speaks of no other submission, but only this, in receiving the bishop's benediction; for, in other respects, the priests in those days were always subject to the emperors. He that would see more proofs of this custom, may consult Valesius,[3] who has collected a great many passages out of other authors relating to it. I shall only add here that rescript of Honorius and Valentinian, which says, "Bishops were the persons to whom all the world bowed the head;—*Quibus omnis terra caput inclinat.*"

Sect. 2.—Of kissing their Hand.

Such another customary respect was paid to them, by kissing their hand, which seems to have accompanied the former ceremony; for St. Ambrose[4] joins them both together, saying, "That kings and princes did not disdain to bend and bow their necks to the knees of the priests, and kiss their hands, thinking themselves protected by their prayers." Paulinus says,[5] "The people paid this respect commonly to St. Ambrose." And Chrysostom,

---

[1] Theod. lib. iv. c. 6. Ὅπως ἀυτῳ τὰς ἡμετέρας ὑποκλίνωμεν κεφαλάς.
[2] Chrys. Hom. 2. ad Pop. Antioch. tom. i. p. 48. [3] Vales. Not. in Theod. lib. iv. c. 6. [4] Ambros. de Dignit, Sacerd. c. 2. Quippe cum videas Regum colla et Principum submitti gentibus Sacerdotum, et exosculatis eorum dexteris, orationibus eorum credant se communiri. [5] Paulin. Vit. Ambros. p. 2 et 3.

speaking of Meletius, bishop of Antioch, says,[1] "At his first coming to the city, the whole multitude went out to meet him, and as many as could come near him, laid hold of his feet, and kissed his hands." They that please to see more of this custom, may consult Sidonius[2] Apollinaris, and Savaro's learned notes[3] upon him, who cites Ennodius, and several other authors to the same purpose.

SECT. 8.—The Custom of singing Hosannas to them sometimes used, but not approved.

St. Jerom mentions another custom, which he condemns as[4] doing too great an honour to mere mortal men, which was the people's singing hosannas to their bishops, as the multitude did to our Saviour at his entrance into Jerusalem. Valesius[5] cites a passage out of Antoninus's Itinerary to the same purpose; where the form of words is, "Blessed be ye of the Lord, and blessed be your coming!—Hosanna in the highest!" Some also understand Hegesippus[6] in the same sense, where, speaking of the preaching of James, bishop of Jerusalem, he says, "The people that were converted by his discourse, cried out, 'Hosanna to the son of David.'" Scaliger understands that as spoken to James himself; but others[7] take it for a doxology, or acclamation to Christ, whom they glorified upon the testimony that James had given him: and this seems to be the truer sense of that place. However, in the the other acceptation, there is nothing contrary to custom in it, as appears from what has been said. I do not insist upon what St. Jerom, in another place, says[8] further of this bishop of Jerusalem; "That he was a man of such celebrated fame among the

---

[1] Chrys. Hom. 45. in Melet. tom. i. p. 593. [2] Sidon. lib. viii. ep. 11. Sancti Gallicini manu osculatâ. Id. lib. vii. ep. 11. [3] Savaro Not. in Sidon. lib. viii. ep. 11. p. 532. [4] Hieron. in Mat. xxi. tom. 9. p. 62. Videant ergo Episcopi, et quantumlibet sancti homines, cum quanto periculo dici ista sibi patiantur, &c. [5] Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. ii. c. 23. [6] Hegesip. ap. Euseb. lib. ii. c. 23. Πολλῶν δοξαζόντων ἐπὶ τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τοῦ Ιακώβου, καὶ λεγόντων, ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ. [7] Grabe Spicileg. Sæc. ii. p. 207, translates it thus: Multi hoc Jacobi testimonio confirmati glorificabant (Jesum) dicentes, Hosanna Filio David. [8] Hieron. Com. in Gal. 1. Jacobus Episcopus Hierosolymorum primus fuit, cognomento Justus; vir tantæ sanctitatis et rumoris in populo, ut fimbriam vestimenti ejus certatim cuperent attingere.

286330

people for his great sanctity, that they ambitiously strove to touch the hem of his garment." For this honour was not paid him as a bishop, but as a most holy man, who was, indeed, according to the character given him by Hegesippus and Epiphanius, a man of singular abstinence and piety, and one of the miracles of the age he lived in. So that this was a singular honour done to him, for his singular holiness and virtue.

Sect. 4.—What meant by the *Corona Sacerdotalis*, and the Form of saluting Bishops *Per Coronam*.

But to proceed with the common honours paid to bishops. Another instance of respect may be observed in the usual forms of addressing them; for when men spake to them, they commonly prefaced their discourse with some title of honour, such as that of *Precor Coronam*, and *Per Coronam vestram*, which we may English, *your honour and dignity;* literally, *your crown.* This form often occurs in Sidonius Apollinaris, Ennodius, St. Jerom,[1] and others. St. Austin says, "Both the Catholics[2] and Donatists used it, when they spake to the bishops of either party; giving them very respectful titles, and intreating, or rather adjuring them, *Per Coronam*, that they would hear and determine their secular causes."

Sect. 5.—Whether Bishops anciently wore a Mitre, or any the like Ornament.

The use of this form of speech then is plain; but the reason of it is not so evident. Savaro,[3] and some others, fancy it respected the ancient figure of the clerical tonsure; by which the hair was cut into a round, from the crown of the head downwards. Others think it came from the ornament which bishops wore upon their heads, and that they will needs have to be a crown or mitre; whereas, it does

---

[1] Sidon. lib. vi. ep. 3. Auctoritas coronæ tuæ, &c. Id. lib. vii. ep. 8. ad Euphron. De minimis rebus coronam tuam maximisque consulerem. Ennod. Lib. iv. ep. 29. ad Symmac. Lib. v. ep. 17. ad Marcellinum. Lib. ix. ep. 27. ad Aurelian. Hieron. Ep. 26. ad August. inter Ep. Aug. Precor coronam tuam.

[2] Aug. Ep. 147. ad Proculeian. Episc. partis Donati. Honorant nos vestri, honorant vos nostri. Per coronam nostram nos adjurant vestri; per coronam vestram vos adjurant nostri.

[3] Savaro Not. in Sidon. lib. vi. ep. 3. Baron. an. lviii. n. 134.

not appear that bishops had any such ornament in those days. I know, indeed, both Valesius[1] and Petavius[2] are very confident, that all bishops, from the very first, had an appendant badge of honour in their foreheads, which they say was the same with the *petalum*, or *golden plate*, which the Jewish high-priests wore. And it cannot be denied, but that as ancient an author as Polycrates,[3] mentioned both by Eusebius and St. Jerom, says, "That St. John was a priest, wearing a *petalum*." And Epiphanius[4] says the same of James, bishop of Jurusalem. But this was not spoken of them as Christian bishops, but on presumption of their having been Jewish priests, and of the family of Aaron. Valesius himself cites a MS. passion of St. Mark, which sets the same ornament on his head, and gives this very reason for it. "It is reported," says he, "that St. Mark, according to the rites of the carnal sacrifice, wore the chief-priest's *petalum* among the Jews; which gives us plainly to understand,"[5] says that author, "that he was one of the tribe of Levi, and of the family of Aaron." So he did not take this for the ornament of a Christian bishop, but a Jewish priest; and that opens the way for us to understand what the other authors meant by it; however Valesius chanced not to observe it. Now if it cannot be proved that bishops anciently wore any such ornament as this, it will much less follow that they wore a royal crown, or mitre, as Spondanus[6] asserts they did, and thence deduces the custom of addressing them *Per Coronam;* therein deserting his great master, Baronius, who assigns another reason for it. After all, it seems most probable, that it was no more than a metaphorical expression, used to denote the honour and dignity of the episcopal order; though I do not deny that the clerical tonsure was sometimes called *corona;* but that was not peculiar to bishops, but common to all the clergy.

---

[1] Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. v. c. 24. [2] Petav. Not. in Epiph. Hær. lxxviii. n. 14. [3] Polycrat. ap. Euseb. lib. v. c. 24. [4] Epiphan. Hær. xxix. n. 2. It. lxxviii. n. 14. [5] Auctor MS. Passion. S. Marc. ap. Vales. ibid. B. Marcum, juxta ritum carnalis sacrificii, pontificalis apicis Petalum in populo gestâsse Judæorum, illustrium virorum syngraphæ declarant: ex quo manifestè datur intelligi, de stirpe eum Leviticâ, immo Pontificis Aaron sacræ successionis originem habuisse. [6] Spondan. Epitom. Baron. an. lviii. n. 54.

SECT. 6.—Of the Titles Ἁγιώτατοι, *Sanctissimi, &c.*

It will not be improper to add, while we are upon this point, that it was usual in men's addresses to bishops, or in speaking of them, to mention their names with some additional titles of respect, such as, Θεοφιλέστατοι and Ἁγιώτατοι, *most dear to God*, and *most holy fathers;* which titles occur frequently in the emperor's rescripts in the civil[1] law, and were of such common use in those times, that Socrates (when he comes to the sixth book of his history, which treats of his own times) thinks himself obliged to make some apology[2] for not giving the bishops that were then living these titles; which I the rather note, because of the vanity of some, who reckon the title, most holy father, the pope's sole prerogative; and to correct the malice of others, who will not allow a Protestant bishop to receive that title, without the suspicion and imputation of popery. As if St. Austin and St. Jerom had been to blame, because the one wrote, and the other received epistles always thus inscribed; *Domino vere Sancto, et Beatissimo Papæ Augustino.* See St. Austin's Epist. 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21. were St. Jerom and others give him those honourable titles.

SECT. 7.—Bishops distinguished by their Throne in the Church.

There is one thing more that must not be omitted, because it was the common honour and privilege of all bishops, to be distinguished in the Church, by a chair or seat, which was commonly called their throne. Thus[3] Eusebius calls the bishop of Jerusalem's seat, "θρόνον Αποστολικὸν, *the apostolical throne*," because St. James, bishop of Jerusalem, first sat in it. And for the same reason, Gregory Nazianzen[4] calls the bishop of Alexandria's seat, "the throne of St. Mark." It was otherwise called βῆμα, and θρόνος ὑψηλὸς, *the high throne;* because it was exalted something higher than the seats of the presbyters, which were on each side of it, and were called the second thrones, as we shall see hereafter, when we come to speak of pres-

[1] Justin. Novel. 8, 40, 42, 67, 86, &c. Concil. Chalced. Act. 10.
[2] Socrat. Procem. ad lib. vi. [3] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 19, et 32.
[4] Naz. Orat. 21. in Laud. Athanas. tom. i. p. 377

byters. All that I shall observe further here, concerning this throne of the bishops, is, though it be some times called the high and lofty throne, especially by those writers[1] who speak in a rhetorical strain. Yet that is only meant comparatively, in respect of the lower seats of presbyters; for otherwise, it was a fault in any bishop, to build himself a pompous and splendid throne, in imitation of the state and grandeur of the secular magistrates. This was one of the crimes which the council of Antioch,[2] in their synodical epistle against Paulus Samosatensis, laid to his charge, that he built himself an high and stately tribunal, not as a disciple of Christ, but as one of the rulers of the world; making a *secretum* to it, in imitation of the secular magistrates, whose tribunals had a place railed out from the rest, and separated by a veil, which they called, the *secretum*, and the ambitious bishop gave his the same name; by which, and some other such like practices, he raised the envy and hatred of the heathens against the Christians, as they there complain of him. It was then the great care of the Christian Church, to observe a decorum in the honours which she bestowed upon her bishops, that they might be such as might set them above contempt, but to keep them below envy; make them venerable, but not minister to vanity or the outward pomp and ostentation of secular greatness.

CHAP. X.

Of the Age, and some particular Qualifications required in such as were to be Ordained Bishops.

Sect. I.—Bishops not to be ordained under Thirty Years of Age, except they were Men of extraordinary Worth.

Those qualfiications of bishops, which were common to them with the rest of the clergy, shall be spoken of hereafter; here I shall only take notice of a few that were more pecu-

---

[1] Naz. Somnium de Eccl. Anastas sublimi throno insidere mihi videbar. Id. Orat. 20. in laud. Basil. p. 342. ἐπὶ τὸν ὑψηλὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς θρόνον. &c.
[2] Ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. 30.

liar to them. Such as, first, their age; which by the canons was required to be at least thirty years. The council of Neocæsarea[1] requires thirty in presbyters; which is a certain argument that the same age was requisite in a bishop. The council of Agde[2] more expressly limits their age to that time; requiring all metropolitans to insist upon it in their ordination. The reasons given by these councils are; because our Saviour himself did not begin to teach before he was thirty years old, and because that is the perfect age of man; therefore though a man was otherwise never so well qualified the council of Neocæsarea says, "he shall wait, and not be ordained so much as presbyter before that time." But whether this rule was always observed from the days of the Apostles, may be questioned; for there is no such rule given by the Apostles in Scripture. That which goes under their name in the Constitutions[3] requires a bishop to be fifty years old before he is ordained; except he be a man of singular merit and worth, which may compensate for the want of years. This shews that the custom of the Church varied in this matter, and that persons of extraordinary qualification were not always tied to be of such an age. Timothy was ordained young, as may be collected from what the Apostle says to him, 1 Tim. iv. 12. "Let no man despise thy youth." The history of the Church affords many other such instances. Eusebius[4] says, "Gregory Thaumaturgus and his brother Athenodorus were both ordained bishops very young; ἔτι νέους ἄμφω. St. Ambrose[5] says the same of Acholius, bishop of Thessalonica; "That he was young in years, but of mature age in respect of his virtues." And Socrates[6] gives the like account of Paulus, bishop of Constanstinople. Theodoret[7] observes also of Athanasius, "that he was but young when he attended his bishop Alexander at

---

[1] Con. Neocæs. Can. 11. [2] Concil. Agathen. c. 17. Presbyterum vel Episcopum ante triginta annos, id est, antequam ad viri perfecti ætatem perveniat, nullus Metropolitanorum ordinare præsumat. See also Con. Tolet. iv. c. 18. et 19. [3] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 1. [4] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 30. [5] Ambr. Ep. 60. ad Anysium. Benedictus processus juventutis ipsius, in quâ ad summum electus est Sacerdotium, maturo jam probatus virtutum stipendio. [6] Socrat. lib. ii. c. 6. Ἄνδρα νέον μεν τὴν ἡλικίαν, προβεβηκότα δε ταῖς φρεσίν [7] Theod. lib. i. c. 26. νέος μεν ὢν τὴν ἡλικίαν

the council of Nice;" and yet within five months after, he was chosen his successor at Alexandria; which probably was before he was thirty years old: for the council of Nice was not above twenty years after the persecution under Maximian; and yet Athanasius was so young, as not to remember the beginning of that persecution, Anno, 303, but only as he heard it from his fathers. For when he speaks of it, he says,[1] "He learned of his parents, that the persecution was raised by Maximian, grand-father to Constantius." So that if we compute from that time, we can hardly suppose him to be thirty years old, when he was ordained bishop, Anno, 326. It is agreed by all authors[2] that Remigius, bishop of Rhemes, was but twenty-two years old when he was ordained, Anno, 471. And Cotelerius[3] after Nicephorus, says, "St. Eleutherius, an Illyrican bishop, was consecrated at twenty." Ignatius gives a plain intimation, that Damas, bishop of the Magnesians, was but a very young bishop, though he does not expressly mention his age. He calls his[4] ordination, νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, *a youthful ordination*; and therefore cautions the people not to despise him for his age, but to reverence and give place to him in the Lord. Salmasius[5] and Ludovicus Capellus miserably pervert this passage, and force a sense upon it, which the author never so much as dreamt of. They will needs have it, that by the words νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, Ignatius means the novelty of episcopacy in general, that it was but a new and late institution; which is not only contrary to the whole tenour and design of all Ignatius's epistles, but to the plain sense of this passage in particular; which speaks nothing of the institution of episcopacy, but of the age of this bishop, who was but young when he was ordained.

Now, from all this it appears, that though there was a rule in the Church, requiring bishops to be thirty years old when they were ordained; yet it was frequently dispensed with, either in cases of necessity, or in order to promote persons of more extraordinary worth and singular

[1] Athan. Ep. ad Solitar. tom. i. p. 853. [2] Hincmar. Vit. Remig. Baron. an. 471. p. 208. [3] Coteler. Not. in Const. Apost. lib. ii. c. 1. Niceph. lib. iii. c. 29. [4] Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 3. [5] Vid. Pearson. Vindic. Ignat. præf. ad Lector.

qualifications. Yet such dispensations, as qualify boys of eleven or twelve years old to be made bishops are no where to be met with in the primitive Church; though the history of the Papacy affords frequent instances of such promotions, as those that please may see in a catalogue of them, collected by Dr. Reynolds and Mr. Mason, two[1] learned writers of our Church.

Sect. 2.—Bishops to be chosen out of the Clergy of the Church to which they were ordained.

But to return to the bishops of the primitive Church. Another qualification in a bishop, anciently very much insisted on, was, that he should be one of the clergy of the same Church, over which he was to be made bishop. For strangers, who were unknown to the people, were not reckoned qualified by the canons. This is plainly implied by Cyprian,[2] when he says, "The bishop was to be chosen in the presence of the people, who had perfect knowledge of every man's life and actions, by their conversation among them." St. Jerom observes, "That this was the constant custom of Alexandria,[3] from St. Mark, to Dionysius and Heraclas, for the presbyters of the Church to choose a bishop out of their own body." And therefore Julius[4] makes it a strong objection against Gregory, whom the Arians obtruded on the Church of Alexandria in the room of Athanasius, that he was a perfect stranger to the place; neither baptized there, nor known to any; whereas, the ordination of a bishop ought not to be so uncanonical; but he should be ordained by the bishops of the province in his own Church, and be ἀπ' ἀυτῆ τῆ ἱερατείᾳ, ἀπ' ἀυτῆ τῆ κλήρῳ, *one of the clergy of the Church to which he was ordained.* The ancient bishops of Rome were all of the same mind, so long as they thought themselves obliged to walk by the laws of the Church; for

---

[1] Vid. Rainoldi Apolog. Thes. n. 26. Mason of the Consecrat. of Bishops. lib. 1. c. 5. [2] Cypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Fratr. Hispan. p. 172. Episcopus deligatur plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissimè novit, et uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit. [3] Hieron. Epist. 85. ad Evagr. Alexandriæ à Marco Evangelistâ usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant. [4] Jul. Ep. ad Oriental. ap. Athan. Apol. ii tom. i. p. 749.

Celestin,[1] and Hilary[2] and Leo[3] insist upon the same thing as the common rule and canon of the Church. And we find a law as late as Charles the Great, and Ludovicus Pius, to the same purpose. For in one of their Capitulars[4] it is ordered, "that bishops shall be chosen out of their own diocese, by the election of the clergy and the people." Though, as Baluzius[5] notes, this law did not extend to very many dioceses, for by this time, the French kings had the disposal of all bishoprics in their dominions, except some few Churches, which by special privilege retained the old way of electing; and they did not bind themselves to nominate bishops always out of the clergy of that Church which was vacant, but used their liberty to choose them out of any other. As now it is become the privilege and custom of kings and princes almost in all nations; which is the occasion of the difference betwixt the ancient and modern practice in this particular. For while the ancient way of elections continued, the general rule was for every Church to make choice of one of her own clergy to be her bishop, and not a stranger.

Sect. 3.—Some Exceptions to this Rule.

Yet in some extraordinary cases this rule admitted of legal exceptions; particularly in these three cases. 1. When it was found for the benefit of the Church to translate bishops from one see to another. In this case though the bishop was a stranger, yet his translation being canonical, was reckoned no violation of this law. 2. When the Church could not unanimously agree upon one in their own body, then to pacify their heats and end their controversies, the emperor or a council proposed one of another Church to their choice, or promoted him by their own authority. Upon this ground Nectarius, Chrysostom, and Nestorius, all strangers, were made bishops of Constantinople. It

---

[1] Cælestin. Ep. ii. ad Episc. Narbon. c. 4, et 5. [2] Hilar. Pap. Epist. 1. ad Ascan. Tarracon. c. 3. [3] Leo Ep. 84. ad Anastas. c. 6. [4] Capitular. Caroli et Ludov. lib. i. c. 84. Episcopi per electionem Cleri et Populi, secundum statuta canonum, de propriâ diœcesi eligantur. [5] Baluz. Not. ad Concilia Gall. Narbon. p. 34. It. Not. ad Gratian. Dist. lxiii. c. xxxiv. p. 467.

was to end the disputes that arose in the Church, which was divided in their elections, as Socrates[1] and Sozomen give an account of them. 3. Sometimes men's extraordinary merit gave them preference, though strangers, before all the members of the Church to which they were chosen. As St. Ambrose[2] observes of Eusebius Vercellensis, that he was chosen, *posthabitis civibus, before all that were citizens, or bred in the place*, though none of the electors had ever seen him before, but only heard of his fame and character: and there are many other instances of the like nature. But excepting some such cases as these, the rule was generally observed, to choose no one bishop of any place, who was not known to the people, and a member of the same Church before.

SECT. 4.—Bishops to go through the Inferior Orders of the Church.

Another qualification required in a bishop was, that he should arise gradually to his honour, and not come to the throne *per saltum*; but first pass through some, if not all the inferior orders of the Church. The council of Sardica has a canon[3] very full to this purpose: "If any rich man or pleader at the law, desire to be made a bishop, he shall not be ordained, till he has first gone through the offices of reader, deacon, and presbyter; that behaving himself worthily in each of these offices, he may ascend gradually to the height of the episcopal function; and in every one of these degrees he shall continue some considerable time, that his faith, and good conversation, and constancy, and moderation may be known." The same rule is prescribed by the council of Bracara[4] and some others. And that it was the ancient practice of the Church, appears from what Cyprian says[5] of Cornelius, "that he was not made bishop of Rome all of a sudden, but went gradually through all the offices of the

[1] Socrat. lib. vi. c. 2. lib. vii. c. 29. Sozom. lib. viii. c. 2. [2] Ambros. Ep. 82. ad Eccl. Vercel. [3] Concil Sardic. can. 10. [4] Concil. Bracar. I. c. 39. Per singulos gradus eruditus ad Sacerdotium veniat. [5] Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 103. Non iste ad Episcopatum subitò pervenit, sed per omnia Ecclesiastica officia promotus, et in divinis administrationibus Dominum sæpe promeritus, ad Sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus ascendit.

Church, till his merits advanced him to the episcopal throne." Theodoret[1] commends Athanasius upon the same account; and Gregory Nazianzen[2] speaks to the honour of St. Basil, with some reflection on several bishops of his age, "that he did not as soon as he was baptized leap into a bishopric, as some other ambitious persons did, but rise to his honour by degrees." He adds, "that in military affairs, this rule was generally observed; every great general is first a common soldier, then a captain, then a commander; and it would be happy for the Church," says he, "if matters were always so ordered in it." By this time it seems this rule was frequently transgressed, without any reason or necessity; but only by the ambition of some who affected the office of bishop, yet were not willing to undergo the inferior offices that were preparative to it.

SECT. 5.—Deacons might be ordained Bishops, though never ordained Presbyters.

But I must observe, that it was not always necessarily required, that a man should be ordained presbyter first in order to be made a bishop; for deacons were as commonly made bishops as any other. Cæcilian was no more than archdeacon[3] of Carthage, when he was ordained bishop, as we learn from Optatus. And both Theodoret[4] and Epiphanius[5] say, "that Athanasius was but a deacon, when he was made bishop of Alexandria." Liberatus observes the same[6] of Peter Moggus and Esaias, two other bishops of Alexandria; as also of Agapetus[7] and Vigilius, bishops of Rome. Socrates[8] and Theodoret[9] relate the same of Felix, bishop of Rome, who was ordained in the place of Liberius. Eusebius[10] takes notice of one of his own name, a deacon of Alexandria, who was made bishop of Laodicea. And Socrates[11] says Chrysostom made Heraclides, one of his own deacons, bishop of Ephesus, and Serapion, bishop of Heraclea. And that this was

[1] Theod. lib. i. c. 25. [2] Naz. Orat. 20. in Laud. Basil. p. 335. [3] Optat. lib. i. p. 41. [4] Theodor. lib. i. c. 25. [5] Epiphan. Hær. 69. Arian. [6] Liberat. Breviar. c. 16 et 18. [7] Liberat. ibid. c. 21 et 22. [8] Socrat. lib. ii. c. 37. [9] Theod. lib. ii. c. 17. [10] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 11. [11] Socrat. lib. vi. c. 11. Lib. vi. c 4 et 17.

a general practice, and agreeable to canon, appears also from a letter of pope Leo, where speaking of the election of a metropolitan, he says,[1] "he ought to be chosen either out of the presbyters, or out of the deacons of the Church."

Sect. 6.—Bishops in Cases of Necessity chosen out of the Inferior Orders.

Sometimes in cases of necessity bishops were chosen out of the inferior orders, subdeacons, readers, &c. Liberatus says, Silverius, who was competitor with Vigilius for the bishopric of Rome, was but a subdeacon.[2] And St. Austin himself, when he erected his new bishopric at Fussala, being disappointed of the person whom he intended to have had consecrated bishop, offered one Antonius, a reader, to the primate, to be ordained bishop in his room; and the primate, without any scruple immediately ordained him; though, as St. Austin[3] testifies, he was but a young man, who had never showed himself in any other office of the Church beside that of reader.

Sect. 7.—And in some extraordinary Cases ordained immediately from Laymen.

There want not also several instances of persons, who were ordained bishops immediately of laymen, when God, by his particular providence, seemed to point them out as the fittest men, in some certain junctures, to be employed in his service. Thus it was in the known case of St. Ambrose, who was but newly baptized, when he was ordained bishop, as both Paulinus,[4] and all the historians testify. When the people of Milan were so divided in the election of a bishop, that the whole city was in an uproar, he being prætor of the place, came in upon them, to appease the tumult, as by virtue of his office he thought himself obliged to do; and making an eloquent speech to them, it had a sort of miraculous effect upon them; for they all immediately left off their dispute, and unanimously cried out, "They would have Ambrose to be their bishop;" which the emperor un-

---

[1] Leo Ep. lxxxiv. c. 6. Ex Presbyteris ejusdem Ecclesiæ, vel ex Diaconibus eligatur. [2] Liberat. Brev. c. 22. [3] Aug. Ep. cclxi. ad Cælestin. [4] Paulin. Vit. Ambros. p. 3. Ruffin. lib ii. c. 11. Theod. lib. iv. c. 6 et 7. Socrat. lib. iv. c. 30. Sozom. lib. vi. c. 24.

anding, and looking upon it as a providential call, he ed him to be baptized, (for he was but yet a catechu-) and in a few days after to be ordained their bishop. yprian was another instance of the like providential nsation; for Pontius[1] says, in his life, "That he was an bishop by the judgment of God and the favour of people, though he was but a neophyte, or newly bap- ." Socrates[2] and Sozomen[3] say the same of Necta- Gregory Nazienzen's successor at Constantinople, at he was chosen bishop by the second general-coun- hilst he had his mystical garments on him," meaning white garments, which the newly-baptized were used ear. Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, in Pontus, St. 's predecessor, was not baptized, but only a catechu- when he was chosen bishop, as Nazianzen himself[4] ms us. And Eucherius was but a monk, that is, a lay- when he was chosen and ordained bishop of Lyons, aronius[5] says, from Hilarius Arelatensis, in the life of oratus. Chrysostom[6] seems to say the same of Philo- us, bishop of Antioch, when he reports of him, "That as taken from the court of judicature, and carried from judge's bench to the bishop's throne, ἀπὸ βήματος ικῆ ἐπὶ βῆμα ἱερόν. In all these instances there seems ve been the hand of God, and the direction of provi- e, which supersedes all ordinary rules and canons; herefore these ordinations were never censured as un- nical or irregular, though contrary to the letter of a non rule. Because the rule itself was to be understood this limitation and exception, as one of the ancient ns[7] explains itself, and all others that relate to this er; saying, "One that is newly converted from Gen- , or a vicious life, ought not presently to be advanced bishopric; for it is not fit that he who has yet given no

---

nt; Vit. Cypr. p. 2. Judicio Dei et plebis favore ad officium Sacerdotii copatûs gradum adhuc Neophytus, et, ut putabatur, Novellus, electus est- it. lib. v. c. 8. [2] Sozom. lib. vii. c. 8. τὴν μυστικὴν ἰσθῆτα ἔτι μενος, &c. [4] Naz. Orat. vix. de Laud. Patr. t. i. p. 308. n. an. 441 p. 9. [6] Chrys. Hom. 31 de S. Philogon. tom. i. p. 397. n. Apost. c. 80.

proof of himself, should be made a teacher of others; unless it be so ordained by the grace and appointment of God himself, εἰ μὴπς κατὰ θείαν χάριν τῦτο γένοιτο." For in this case there could be no dispute, the will of God being superior to all human canons whatsoever. And therefore, though the same limitation be not expressed in other canons, yet it is evident that they are always to be understood with this exception: upon which account, it was not reckoned any breach of canon to make a layman bishop, when providence seemed first to grant a dispensation, by directing the Church to be unanimous in the choice of such a person. They did not, in such cases, make a layman receive one order one day, and another the next, and so go through the several orders in the compass of a week, but made him bishop at once, when need required, without any other ordination. The contrary custom is a modern practice, scarce ever heard of till the time of Photius, Anno, 858, who, to avoid the imputation of not coming gradually to his bishopric, was, on the first day, made a monk, on the second, a reader, on the third, a sub-deacon, on the fourth, a deacon, on the fifth, a presbyter, and on the sixth, a patriarch, as Nicetas David,[1] a writer of that age, informs us in the Life of Ignatius. Spalatensis[2] observes the same practice to be continued in the Romish Church, under pretence of complying with the ancient canons; though nothing can be more contrary to the true intent and meaning of them, which was, that men should continue some years in every order, to give some proof of their behaviour to the Church, and not pass cursorily through all orders, in five or six days time; which practice, as it does not answer the end of the canons, so it is altogether without precedent in the primitive Church.

---

[1] Nicet. Vit. Ignat. Concil. tom. viii. p. 1199.

[2] Spalat. de Repub. lib. iii. c. 4. n. 19. p. 430.

CHAP. XI.

Of some particular Laws and Customs observed about the Ordination of Bishops.

SECT. 1.—Bishoprics not to be void above three Months.

WHEN any bishopric became void by the death or cession of its bishop, then, forasmuch as bishops were looked upon as a necessary constituent part of the Church, all imaginable care was taken to fill up the vacancy with all convenient speed. In the African Churches a year was the utmost limit that was allowed for a vacancy; for if within that time a new election was not made, he that was appointed administrator of the Church during the vacancy, whose business it was to procure and hasten the election, was to be turned out of his office, and a new one put in his room, by a canon of the fifth council of Carthage,[1] which is also confirmed in the African code.[2] But in other places this was limited to a much shorter time: for by a canon[3] of the general council of Chalcedon, every metropolitan is obliged to ordain a new bishop in the vacant see, within the space of three months, under pain of ecclesiastical censure, unless some unavoidable necessity forced him to defer it longer.

SECT. 2.—In some Places a new Bishop was chosen before the old one was buried.

At Alexandria the custom was to proceed immediately to election as soon as the bishop was dead, and before he was interred. Epiphanius[4] hints at this custom, when he says, "They were used to make no delay after the decease of a bishop, but chose one presently, to preserve peace among the people, that they might not run into factions about the choice of a successor." But Liberatus[5] is a little more par-

---

[1] Con. Carth. 5. can. 8. [2] Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric. can. 75. [3] Con. Chalced. can. 25. [4] Epiphan. Hær. 69. Arian. n. 11. μὴ χρονίζειν μετὰ τελευτὴν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, &c. [5] Liberat. Breviar. c. 20. Consuetudo quidem est Alexandriæ, illum, qui defuncto succedit, excubias super defuncti corpus agere, manumque dexteram ejus capiti suo imponere; et sepulto manibus suis, accipere collo suo Beati Marci pallium, et tunc legitimè sedere.

ticular in describing the circumstances of it. He says, "it was customary for the successor to watch over the body of the deceased bishop, and to lay his right hand upon his head, and to bury him with his own hands, and then take the pall of St. Mark, and put it upon himself, and so sit in his throne." To these authorities we may add that of Socrates,[1] who says, "that Cyril, of Alexandria, was enthroned the third day after the death of Theophilus." And he intimates, that the same thing was practised in other places; for Proclus, bishop of Constantinople,[2] was enthroned before Maximian, his predecessor, was interred; and, after his enthronement, he performed the funeral office for him. And this was done at the instance and command of the emperor Theodosius, that there might be no dispute or tumult raised in the Church about the election of a bishop.

Sect. 3.—Some Instances of longer Vacancies in Times of Difficulty and Persecution.

Yet, notwithstanding this care and diligence of the Church in filling up vacant sees, it sometimes happened, that the election of bishops was deferred to a much longer season. For in Afric, at the time of the collation of Carthage, there were no less than three-score bishoprics void at once, which was above an eighth part of the whole; for the whole number of bishops was but four hundred and sixty-six, whereof two hundred and eighty-six were then present at the conference, and one hundred and twenty were absent by reason of sickness or old age; besides which, there were sixty vacant sees, which were unprovided of bishops at that time, as the Catholics[3] told the Donatists, who pretended to vie numbers with them, though they were but two hundred and seventy-nine. What was the particular reason of so many vacancies at that juncture, is not said; but probably it might be the difficulty of the times, that Catholic bishops could not there be placed where the

---

[1] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 7. [2] Id. lib. vii. c. 40. [3] Aug. Brevic. Collat. primæ Diei. c. 14. Sanè propter Cathedras, quas Episcopis vacuas apud se esse dixerunt, responsum est a Catholicis, sexaginta esse, quibus successores Episcopi nondum fuerant ordinati.

Donatists had gotten full possession. Or, perhaps, it might be the negligence of the people, who contented themselves with administrators during the vacancy, and would not admit of a new bishop. The council of Macriani, mentioned by Fulgentius Ferrandus,[1] takes notice of this dilatory practice in some Churches, and censures it by a canon, which orders the administrators, who were always some neighbouring bishops, to be removed; and condemns such Churches to continue without administrators, till they sought for a bishop of their own. Another reason of long vacancies in some times and places, was the difficult circumstances the Churches lay under in time of persecution: For the bishops were the men chiefly aimed at by the persecutors; and therefore, when one bishop was martyred, the Church sometimes was forced to defer the ordination of another, either because it was scarce possible to go about it in such times of exigency, or because she was unwilling to expose another bishop immediately to the implacable fury of a raging adversary, and bring upon herself a more violent storm of persecution. The Roman[2] clergy give this for their reason to Cyprian, why, after the martyrdom of Fabian, they did not immediately proceed to a new election: the state of affairs, and the difficulty af the times, was such as would not permit it. Baronius[3] reckons the time of this vacancy a year and three months; but others,[4] who are more exact in the calculation, make it a year and five months; by either of which accounts, it was above a year beyond the time limited by the canons. But this was nothing in comparison of that long vacancy of the bishopric of Carthage, in the time of the Arian persecution, under Gensericus and Hunericus, two heretical kings of the Vandals, which Victor Uticensis[5] says was no less than twenty-four years,

---

[1] Ferrand. Brev. Canon. c. 23. ap. Justel. tom. i. p. 440. Ut Interventores Episcopi conveniant plebis quæ Episcopum non habent, ut Episcopum accipiant; quod si accipere neglexerint, remoto Interventore sic remaneant, quàm diu sibi Episcopum quærant. [2] Ep. xxxi. al. xxx. ap. Cyprian. p. 59. Post excessum nobilissimæ memoriæ viri Fabiani, nondum est Episcopus propter rerum et temporum difficultates constitutus. [3] Baron. an. 253. n. 6. an. 254. n. 46. [4] Pearson. Annal. Cypr. an. 250. n. 3. et an. 251. n. 6. [5] Victor. de Persecut. Vandal. lib. ii.

during all which time the Church of Carthage had no bishop. But these were difficulties upon the Church, and matters of force, not her choice; for in times of peace she always acted otherwise, and did not think such extraordinary instances fit precedents to be drawn into example, much less to be drawn into consequence and argued upon, as some[1] have done, that, therefore, the Church may be without bishops, because she subsisted, in some extraordinary vacancies, without them, when she could not have them; which argument would hold as well against any other order as that of bishops, did but they who urge this argument rightly consider it.

SECT. 4.—Three Bishops required to the Ordination of a Bishop.

But to return to the ordination of bishops. At the time appointed for ordination, the metropolitan was used to send forth his circular letters, and summon all the bishops of the province to meet at the place where the new bishop was to be ordained, and assist at his consecration. The presence of them all was required, if they could conveniently attend; if not, they were to send their consent in writing; in which case, three bishops, with the assistance or consent of the metropolitan, were reckoned a sufficient canonical number to perform the ceremony of consecration. St. Cyprian[2] speaks of it as the general practice of the Church in his time, to have all the bishops of the province present at any such ordination. And Eusebius[3] particularly takes notice of the ordination of Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, who succeeded Narcissus, that he was ordained *μετὰ κοινῆς τῶν ἐπισκόπων γνώμης, with the common consent of the bishops of his province.* The council of Chalcedon[4] calls this a canonical ordination, when the metropolitan, with all or most of his provincial bishops, ordain the bishops of their own province, as the canons have appointed. And the general

[1] Blondel. Apol. [2] Cypr. Ep. lxviii. al. lxvii. ad Fratr. Hispan. p. 172. Quod apud nos quoque et ferè per provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes ritè celebrandas, ad eam plebem, cui Præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, et Episcopus deligatur plebe præsente, &c. [3] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 11. [4] Con. Chalced. Act. xvi. c. tom. 4. p. 817.

council of Constantinople[1] justified the ordinations of Flavian, bishop of Antioch, and Cyril, of Jerusalem, as canonical in this respect, because they were ordained by the bishops of their provinces, synodically met together. This was the ancient rule of the council of Nice, which requires the assistance of all the bishops of the province, if they could conveniently[2] attend the ordination. But, forasmuch as that either, through urgent necessity, or by reason of their great distance, it might happen that all of them could not be present, it is added, "That in that case, three bishops should be sufficient to ordain, provided the metropolitan and the rest sent their consent in writing; but, under three, the canons did not generally allow of." The first council of Arles,[3] and the third of Carthage,[4] require three besides the metropolitan. And the second council of Arles[5] does not allow the metropolitan to be one of the three; but saith expressly, "That he shall take the assistance of three provincial bishops beside himself, and not presume to ordain a bishop without them." It is true those called the Apostolical Canons[6] and Constitutions[7] allow the ordination that is performed by two bishops only. But this is contrary to all other canons; which are so far from allowing two bishops to ordain by themselves, that the council of Orange[8] orders both the ordaining bishops, and the ordained, to be deposed: and the council of Riez[9] actually deposed Armentarius for this very thing; because he had not three bishops to ordain him. All Churches, indeed, did not punish such ordinations with the same severity; but in all places they

---

[1] Ep. Synod. ap. Theodor. lib. v. c. 9. [2] Con. Nic. con. 4. Ἐπίσκοπον προσήκει μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθίστασθαι. [3] Con. Arelat. i. c. 21. Si non potuerint septem, sine tribus fratribus non præsumant ordinare. [4] Con. Carth. 3. can. 39. Forma antiqua servabitur, ut non minus quàm tres sufficiant, qui fuerint à Metropolitano directi ad ordinandum Episcopum. See also Con. Carth. vi. c. 4. [5] Con. Arelat. ii. c. 5. Nec Episcopus Metropolitanus sine tribus Episcopis comprovincialibus præsumat Episcopum ordinare. [6] Can. Apost. c. 1. Ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων δύω ἢ τριῶν. [7] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 27. [8] Con. Arausic. 1. can. 21. [9] Con. Reiens. can. 1. Ordinationem, quam Canones irritam definiunt, nos quoque vacuandam esse censimus; in quâ, prætermissâ trium præsentiâ, nec expetitis comprovincialium literis, Metropolitani quoque voluntate neglectâ, prorsus nihil quod Episcopum faceret ostensum est.

were reckoned uncanonical. When Paulinus ordained Evagrius, bishop of Antioch, Theodoret[1] takes notice "that this was done against the laws of the Church," because he was ordained by a single person, and without the consent of the provincial bishops. And Synesius[2] says the same of the ordination of Siderius, bishop of Palæbisca, "that it was irregular," because he neither had the consent of the bishop of Alexandria, his metropolitan, nor three bishops to ordain him. It was to avoid this censure of irregularity, that Novatian, when he set himself up to be bishop of Rome, against Cornelius, sent for three bishops out of the furthest corner of Italy, to come and ordain[3] him, lest it should be objected against him, that he had not a canonical ordination. And upon this account, when Pelagius the First was to be ordained bishop of Rome, because three bishops could not be procured, a presbyter[4] was taken in to make up the number; in all which, the general practice of the Church is very clearly seen and described.

SECT. 5.—Yet Ordinations by one Bishop allowed to be valid, though not canonical.

Yet it must be observed, though this was the common rule and practice of the Church, yet it was not simply and absolutely of the essence of ordination; for the Church many times admitted of the ordinations of bishops that were consecrated only by one or two bishops. The council of Orange,[5] which orders both the ordaining bishops and the ordained to be deposed, in case two bishops only ordained a bishop with his consent, decrees notwithstanding, "that if a bishop was ordained, by any sort of violence, against his will, though only by two bishops, in that case, his ordination should stand good, because he was passive in the thing, and not consenting to the breach of the canons. And without this passivity there are several instances of ordinations by two bishops only, the validity of which we do

[1] Theod. lib. v. c. 23. [2] Syncs. Ep. 67. [3] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. ex Epist. Cornel. [4] Lib. Pontifical. Vit. Pelag. Dum non essent Episcopi, qui eum ordinarent, inventi sunt duo Episcopi, Joannes de Perusio, et Bonus de Ferentino, et Andreas Presbyter de Ostiâ, et ordinaverunt eum. [5] Con. Arausic. I. c. 21.

not find disputed. Pelagius, bishop of Rome, was reckoned a true bishop, though, as we have just now heard, he had but two bishops and a presbyter to ordain him. Dioscorus, of Alexandria, was consecrated likewise by two bishops only, and those under ecclesiastical censure; as we learn from an epistle of the bishops of Pontus,[1] at the end of the council of Chalcedon. Yet neither that council, nor any others, ever questioned the validity of his ordination, unless, perhaps, those Pontic bishops did, who call it *nefandam atque imaginariam ordinationem.* Siderius, bishop of Palæbisca, was ordained by one bishop; yet Athanasius not only allowed his ordination and confirmed it, but finding him to be a useful man, he afterwards advanced him, as Synesius[2] says, to the metropolitical see of Ptolemais. Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, ordained Evagrius, his successor, without any other bishop to assist him; which, though it was done against canon, yet Theodoret assures us,[3] that both the bishops of Rome and Alexandria owned Evagrius for a true bishop, and never in the least questioned the validity of his ordination. And though they afterwards consented to acknowledge Flavian, (at the instance of Theodosius,) to put an end to the schism, yet they did it upon this condition, that the ordinations of such as had been ordained by Evagrius, should be reputed valid also; as we learn from the letters of pope Innocent,[4] who lived not long after this matter was transacted.

SECT. 6.—The bishop of Rome not privileged to ordain alone, any more than any other single Bishop.

Hence it appears, that the ordination of a bishop made by any single bishop was valid, if the Church thought fit to allow it; nor had the bishop of Rome any peculiar privilege in this matter above other men, though some pretend to

---

[1] Concil. tom. iv. p. 960. Ordinationem suam à damnatis Episcopis, et hoc duobus, accepit, cùm Regulæ Patrum ——— vel tres Episcopos corporaliter adesse in hujusmodi dispensationibus omnino prospiciant. [2] Synes. Ep. 67. [3] Theod. lib. v. c. 23. [4] Innoc. Ep. 14 ad Bonifac. Ecclesia Antiochena ita pacem postulavit et meruit, ut et Evagrianos suis ordinibus ac locis, intemeratâ ordinatione, quam acceperant a memorato, [illegible]

make a distinction. There is indeed an ancient canon alleged in the collection of Fulgentius Ferrandus, out of the council of Zella and the letters of Siricius, which seems to make a reserve in behalf of the bishop of Rome; for it says,[1] "one bishop shall not ordain a bishop, the Roman Church excepted." But Cotelerius[2] ingenuously owns this to be a corruption in the the text of Ferrandus, foisted by the ignorance or fraud of some modern transcriber, who confounded two decrees of Siricius into one, and changed the words, *Sedes Apostolica Primatis*, into *Sedes Apostolica Romana;* for in the words of Siricius[3] there is no mention made at all of the Roman Church, but it is said, "that no one shall ordain without the consent of the Apostolical See, that is, the primate or metropolitan of the province; and that one bishop alone shall not ordain a bishop, because that is arrogant and assuming, and looks like giving an ordination by stealth, and is expressly forbidden by the Nicene council." So that in these times the bishops of Rome were under the direction of the canons, and did not presume to think they had any privilege of ordaining singly, above what was common to the rest of their order.

Sect. 7.—Every Bishop to be ordained in his own Church.

The next thing to be taken notice of in this affair, is that every bishop by the laws and custom of the Church, was to be ordained in his own Church, in the presence of his own people. Which is plainly intimated by Cyprian[4] when he says, "that to celebrate ordinations aright, the neighbouring bishops of the province were used to meet at the Church where the new bishop was to be ordained, and there proceed to his election and ordination." And this was so generally

---

[1] Ferrand. Brev. Canon. c. 6. Ut unus Episcopus Episcopum non ordinet, exceptâ Ecclesiâ Romanâ. Concilo Zellensi. Ex Epistolâ Papæ Siricii.

[2] Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. 20.

[3] Siric. Ep. iv. c. 1. Ut extra conscientiam Sedis Apostolicæ, hoc est, Primatis, nemo audeat ordinare. It. c. 2. Ne unus Episcopus Episcopum ordinare præsumat propter arrogantiam, ne furtivum præstitum beneficium videatur. Hoc enim et a Synodo Nicænâ constitutum est atque definitum.

[4] Cypr. Ep. lxviii. al. lxvii. ad Fratr. Hispan. p. 172. Ad Ordinationes ritè celebrandas, ad eam Plebem, cui Præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, &c.

the practice of the whole Church, that Pope Julius[1] made it an objection against Gregory of Alexandria, who was obtruded on the Church by the Eusebian party, in the room of Athanasius, that he was ordained at Antioch, and not in his own Church, but sent thither with a band of soldiers; whereas by the ecclesiastical canon, he ought to have been ordained, ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *in the Church of Alexandria itself*, and that by the bishops of his own province. This rule was very nicely observed in the African Churches, where it was the constant custom for the primate (whose office it was to ordain bishops) to go to the Church where the new bishop was to be settled, and ordain him there. Of this we have several instances in St. Austin, who himself was ordained in his own Church at Hippo[2] by the primate of Numidia; and having divided his diocese, and erected a new bishopric at Fussala, and elected a bishop, he sent for the primate, though living[3] at a great distance, to come to the place, and ordain him there.

SECT. 8.—The ancient Form of Ordination of Bishops.

As to the manner and form of ordaining a bishop, it is thus briefly described by one of the councils[4] of Carthage; "when a bishop is ordained, two bishops shall hold the book of the Gospels over his head; and, whilst one pronounces the blessing or consecration-prayer, all the rest of the bishops that are present, shall lay their hands upon his head." The ceremony of laying the Gospels upon his head seems to have been in use in all Churches. For the author[5] of the Apostolical Constitutions (a Greek writer who is supposed to relate the customs of the third century) makes mention of it, only with this difference, that instead of two bishops, there two deacons are appointed to hold the Gospels open over his head, whilst the senior bishop or primate, with two other

---

[1] Jul. Ep. ad. Oriental. ap. Athanas. Apol. 2. tom. i. p. 749. [2] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 8. [3] Aug. Ep. 261. Propter quem ordinandum, sanctum senem, qui tunc Primatum Numidæ gerebat, de longinquo ut veniret rogans, literis impetravi. [4] Con. Carth. iv. c. 2. Episcopus cùm ordinatur, duo Episcopi ponant et teneant Evangeliorum codicem super caput et verticem ejus, et uno super eum fundente benedictionem, reliqui omnes Episcopi, qui adsunt, manibus suis caput ejus tangant. [5] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 4.

bishops assisting him, pronounes the prayer of consecration. This ceremony of holding the Gospels over his head, is also mentioned by St. Chrysostom[1] and the author of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, under the name of Dionysius, who says it was a peculiar ceremony used only in the ordination of a bishop.

Sect. 9.—A Form of Prayer used at their Consecration.

The author of the Constitutions recites one of the ancient forms of prayer, the close of which is[2] in these words: "Grant to him, O Lord Almighty, by thy Christ, the communication of the Holy Spirit, that he may have power to remit sins according to thy commandment, and to confer orders according to thy appointment, and to loose every bond according to the power which Thou gavest to the Apostles; that he may please Thee in meekness and a pure heart, constantly, blameless, and without rebuke; and may offer unto Thee that pure unbloody sacrifice, which Thou by Christ hast appointed to be the mystery or sacrament of the new covenant, for a sweet-smelling savour, through Jesus Christ thy Holy Son, our God and Saviour, by whom be glory, honour and worship to Thee, in the Holy Spirit, now and for ever. Amen." It is not to be imagined that one and the same form was used in all Churches; for every bishop having liberty to frame his own liturgy, as there were different liturgies in different Churches, so it is most reasonable to suppose the primates or metropolitans had different forms of consecration though there are now no remains of them in being, to give us any further information.

Sect. 10.—Of their Enthronement, *Homiliæ Enthronisticæ* and *Literæ Enthronisticæ*.

The consecration being ended the bishops that were present conducted the new-ordained bishop to his chair or throne, and there placing him, they all saluted him with an holy kiss in the Lord. Then the Scriptures being read (according to custom, as part of the daily service) the new

[1] Chrys. de Laudib. Evang. cited by Habertus, p. 79. Dionys. Eccles. Hierarch, c. v. par. 3. sect. i. p. 364. [2] Constit. lib. viii. c. 5.

bishop made a discourse or exposition upon them, which was usually called, *Sermo Enthronisticus*, from the time and circumstances in which it was spoken. Such was that famous homily of Meletius, bishop of Antioch, mentioned by Epiphanius[1] and Sozomen, for which he was immediately sent into banishment by Constantius. Socrates frequently takes notice of such homilies made by bishops[2] at their instalment; and Liberatus[3] speaking of Severus of Antioch, mentions his exposition made upon that occassion, calling it, *Expositio in Inthronismo*. It was usual also for bishops immediately after their instalment, to send letters to foreign bishops to give them an account of their faith and orthodoxy, that they might receive letters of peace and communion again from them. Which letters were therefore called *Literæ Enthronisticæ*, or Συλλαβαὶ Ἐνθρονιστικαὶ, as Evagrius[4] terms them, speaking of the circular letters, which Severus, bishop of Antioch, wrote to the rest of the patriarchs upon that occasion. These were otherwise called communicatory letters, Κοινωνικὰ Συγγράμματα, as the council of Antioch, that deposed Paulus Samosatensis, terms them. For the fathers in that council having ordained Domnus in the room of Paul, gave notice thereof to all Churches, telling them, "that they signified it to them for this reason, that they might write to Domnus, and receive, κοινωνικά συγγράμματα,[5] *communicatory letters* from him:" which, as Valesius[6] rightly notes, do not mean there those letters of communion which bishops were used to grant to persons travelling into foreign countries; but such letters as they wrote to each other, upon their own ordination, to testify their communion mutually with one another. These letters are also called *Synodicæ* by Liberatus,[7] who says, "this custom of every new bishop's giving intimation of his own promotion to those of his own order, was so necessary, that the omission of it was interpreted a sort of refusal to hold communion with the rest of the world, and a virtual charge of heresy upon them."

---

[1] Epiphan. Hær. 73. Sozom. lib. iv. c. 28. [2] Socrat. lib. ii. c. 43. Lib. vii. c. 29. [3] Liberat. Breviar. c. 19. [4] Evagr. lib. iv. c. 4. [5] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 30. [6] Vales. Not. in Loc. [7] Liberat. Breviar. c. 17. Quia Literas Synodicas non direxisset, &c

CHAP. XII.

Of the Rule which prohibits Bishops to be ordained in small Cities.

Sect. 1.—The Reason of the Law against placing Bishops in small Cities.

Before I end this discourse about bishops, I must give an account of two rules more respecting their ordination. The first of which was, that bishops should not be placed in small cities or villages. Which law was first made by the council of Sardica, with a design to keep up the honour and dignity of the episcopal order; as the reason is given in the canon made about it; which says, "It shall not be lawful to place a bishop in a village, or small[1] city, where a single presbyter will be sufficient; for in such places, there is no need to set a bishop, lest the name and authority of bishops be brought into contempt." Some add to this the fifty-seventh canon of the council of Laodicea, which forbids the placing of bishops in villages, and in the country,[2] appointing visitors to be constituted in their room; but this canon speaks not of absolute bishops, but of the *Chorepiscopi*, who were subject to other bishops, of which I shall treat particularly hereafter. However there is no dispute about the Sardican canon, for the reason annexed explains its meaning, that it prohibits universally the ordination of bishops in small cities and country places.

Sect. 2.—Some Exceptions to this Rule in Egypt, Libya, Cyprus, Arabia, Asia Minor, &c.

But it may be observed that this rule did never generally obtain; for both before and after the council of Sardica, there were bishops both in small cities and villages. Nazianzum was but a very small city; Socrates[3] calls it πόλις ἐντελής, *a little one;* and upon the same account

---

[1] Con. Sardic. Can. 6. Μὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ ἁπλῶς καθιστᾶν ἐπίσκοπον κώμῃ τινὶ, ἢ βραχείᾳ πόλει. [2] Concil. Laodic. c. 57. [3] Socrat. lib. iv. c. 11 et 26.

Gregory Nazianzen,[1] styles his own father, who was bishop of it, μικροπολίτης, *a little bishop*, and one of the second order. Yet he was no *Chorepiscopus*, but as absolute a bishop in his own diocese, as the bishop of Rome or Alexandria. Gerræ, near Pelusium, was but a small city, as Sozomen[2] notes, yet it was a bishop's see. Theodoret observes the same of Dolicha, where Maris was bishop,[3] that it was but a very little city; πολίκνη σμικρὰ, he calls it. And he says the like of Cucusus,[4] in Armenia, the place whither Chrysostom was banished: yet as small a city as it was, Chrysostom[5] found a bishop there, who treated him very civilly and respectfully in his exile. Synesius makes mention of the bishop of Olbiæ, in one[6] of his epistles, and at the same time tells us the place was but a village; for he calls the people, δῆμος κωμήτης, *a country people*. So he says in another[7] epistle, that Hydrax and Palæbisca had for some time each of them their own bishop; though they were but villages of Pentapolis, formerly belonging to the diocese of Erythra, to which they were some time after annexed again. In Sozomen's time, among the Arabians and Cyprians, it was an usual thing to ordain bishops, not only in cities, but villages; as also among the Novatians and Montanists in Phrygia: all which he affirms[8] upon his own knowledge. Some think Dracontius was such a bishop, because Athanasius[9] styles his bishopric, χώρας ἐπισκοπήν. But whether this means that he was an absolute bishop, or only a *Chorepiscopus*, as others think, is not very easy to determine. As neither what kind of bishops those were, which the council of Antioch,[10] in their synodical epistle against Paulus Samosatensis, calls country bishops; for perhaps they might be only *Chorepiscopi*, or dependant bishops, as Valesius conjectures. But this cannot be said of those mentioned by Sozomen, nor of the other instances I

---

[1] Naz. Orat. 19. de Laud. Patr. tom. i. p. 310. [2] Sozom. lib. viii. c. 19. πολις μικρὰ. [3] Theod. lib. v. c. 4. [4] Theod. lib. ii. c. 5. et Lib. v. c. 34. [5] Chrys. Ep. 125. ad Cyriacum. [6] Synes. Ep. 76. [7] Id. Ep. 67. Κῶμαι δὲ αὗται Πενταπόλεως. [8] Sozom. lib. vii. c. 19. Ἔστιν ὅπῃ καὶ ἐν κώμαις ἐπίσκοποι ἱερῶνται, ὡς παρὰ Ἀραβίοις καὶ Κυπρίοις ἔγνων, &c. [9] Athanas. Epist. ad Dracont. tom. i. p. 954. [10] Ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. 30. Ἐπισκόπους τῶν ὁμόρων ἀχρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων.

have given out of Synesius, and the rest of the fore-cited authors; from whose testimonies it plainly appears, that there were bishops in very small cities, and sometimes in villages, notwithstanding the contrary decree of the Sardican council. It is also very observable, that in Asia Minor, a tract of land not much larger than the isle of Great Britain, (including but two dioceses of the Roman empire) there were almost four hundred bishops; as appears from the ancient Notitia of the Church. Whence it may be collected, that Cucusus and Nazianzum were not the only small cities in those parts; but that there were many other cities and dioceses, of no very great extent, in such a number.

SECT. 3.—Reasons for erecting Bishoprics in small Cities.

One thing that contributed much to the multiplication of bishoprics, and that caused them to be erected sometimes in small places, was, that in the primitive Church every bishop, with the consent of his metropolitan, or the approbation of a provincial council, had power to divide his own diocese, and ordain a new bishop in some convenient part of it, for the good of the Church; whenever he found his diocese too large, or the places to lie at too great a distance, or the multitude of converts to increase, and make the care and incumbrance of his diocese become too great a burden for him. This was the reason why St. Austin[1] erected a new bishopric at Fussala, a town in his own diocese, about forty miles from Hippo. It was a place where great numbers had been converted from the schism of the Donatists, and some remained to be converted still: but the place lying at so great a distance, he could not bestow that care and diligence, either in ruling the one, or regaining the other, which he thought necessary; and therefore he prevailed with the primate of Numidia, to come and ordain one Antonius, to be bishop there. And this was consonant to the rules of the African Church, which allowed new bishoprics

[1] Augustin. Epist. 261. ad Cælestin. Quòd ab Hippone memoratum Castellum millibus quadraginta sejungitur, cùm in eis regendis, et eorum reliquiis, licèt exiguis, colligendis—me viderem latius quàm oportebat extendi, nec adhibendæ sufficerem diligentiæ, quam certissimâ ratione adhiberi debere cernebam, Episcopum ibi ordinandum constituendumque curavi.

to be erected[1] in any diocese where there was need, if the bishop of the diocese and the primate gave their consent to it; or, as Ferrandus[2] has it in his collection, if the bishop, the primate, and a provincial council, by their joint consent and authority, gave way to it. By virtue of these canons, during the time of the schism of the Donatists, many new bishoprics were erected in very small towns in Afric, as appears from the acts of the collation of Carthage, where the Catholics and Donatists mutually charge each other with this practice:—"that they divided single bishoprics sometimes into three or four, and made bishops in country towns and villages to augment the numbers of their parties." Thus in one place, we find Petilian, the Donatist,[3] complaining, "that the Catholics had made four bishops in the diocese of Januarius, a Donatist bishop, to outdo them with numbers;" and, in another place, Alypius, the Catholic, orders it to be entered[4] upon record, "that a great many Donatist bishops, there mentioned, were not ordained in cities, but only in country towns or villages." To which, Petilian[5] replies, "that the Catholics did the same; ordaining bishops in country towns, and sometimes in such places where they had no people." His meaning is, that in those places all the people were turned Donatists, and for that very reason, the Catholic bishops thought themselves obliged to divide their dioceses, and ordain new bishops in small towns, that they might outdo the Donatists, both in number and zeal, and more effectually labour in reducing the straying people back again to their ancient communion with the Catholic Church. This was the practice of Afric, and this their reason for erecting so

---

[1] Concil. Carth. ii. c. 5. Si accedente tempore, crescente Fide, Dei populus multiplicatus desideravit proprium habere Rectorem, ejus videlicet voluntate, in cujus potestate est Diœcesis constituta, habeat Episcopum. It. Con Carth. iii. c. 42. [2] Ferrand. Breviar. Canon. c. 13. Ut Episcopus non ordinetur in Diœcesi, quæ Episcopum nunquam habuit, nisi cum voluntate Episcopi, ad quem ipsa Diœcesis pertinet, ex Concilio tamen plenario et Primatis Authoritate. [3] Collat. Carth. i. c. 117. Petilianus Episcopus dixit, in unâ Plebe Januarii Collegæ nostri præsentis, in unâ Diœcesi, quatuor sunt constituti contra ipsum; ut numerus scilicet augeretur. [4] Ibid. c. 181. Alypius dixit, Scriptum sit istos omnes in villis vel in fundis esse Episcopos ordinatos, non in aliquibus civitatibus. [5] Ibid. c. 182. Petilianus Episcopus dixit: Sic etiam tu multos habes per omnes agros dispersos. Immo crebros ubi habes, sanè et sine populis habes.

many small bishoprics in those times of exigency; they had always an eye to the benefit and edification of the Church.

Gregory Nazianzen, highly commends St. Basil's piety and prudence for the like practice. It happened in his time, that Cappadocia was divided into two provinces, and Tyana made the metropolis of the second province, in the civil account: this gave occasion to Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, to lay claim to the rights of a metropolitan in the Church, which St. Basil opposed, as injurious to his own Church of Cæsarea; which, by ancient custom and prescription, had been the metropolis of the whole province. But Anthimus proving a very contentious adversary, and raising great disturbance and commotions about it, St. Basil was willing to buy the peace of the Church with the loss of his own rights: so he voluntarily relinquished his jurisdiction over that part of Cappadocia, which Anthimus laid claim to, and, to compensate his own loss in some measure, he erected several new bishoprics in his own province; as, at Sasima, and some other such obscure places of that region. Now, though this was done contrary to the letter of a canon, yet Nazianzen extols the fact upon three accounts. First, because hereby a greater care was taken[1] of men's souls. Secondly, by this means every city had its own revenues. And lastly, the war between the two metropolitans was ended. "This," he says, "was an admirable policy, worthy the great and noble soul of St. Basil, who could turn a dispute so to the benefit of the Church, and draw a considerable advantage out of a calamity, by making it an occasion to guard and defend his country with more bishops." Whence we may collect, that in Nazianzen's opinion, it is an advantage to the Church to be well stocked with bishops, and that it is no dishonour to her to have bishops in small towns, when necessity and reason require it.

[1] Naz. Orat. 20. de Laud. Basil. tom. i. p. 356.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Rule which forbids Two Bishops to be ordained in one City.

SECT. 1.—The general Rule and Practice of the Church, to have but one Bishop in a City.

ANOTHER rule generally observed in the Church, was, that in one city there should be but one bishop, though it was large enough to admit of many presbyters. In the time of Cornelius, there were forty-six presbyters[1] in the Church of Rome, seven deacons, as many sub-deacons, and ninety-four of the inferior orders of the clergy; and the body of the people, at a moderate computation, are reckoned by some[2] to be about fifty thousand; by others,[3] to be a far greater number; yet there was but one bishop over all these. So that when Novatian got himself ordained bishop of Rome, in opposition to Cornelius, he was generally condemned over all the world, as transgressing the rule of the Catholic Church. Cyprian[4] delivers it as a maxim upon this occasion, "That there ought to be but one bishop in a Church at a time, and one judge as the vicegerent of Christ." "Therefore," he says,[5] "Novatian was no bishop, since there could not be a second after the first; but he was an adulterer,[6] and a foreigner, and an ambitious usurper of another man's church, who had been regularly ordained before him." And so he was told not only by Cyprian,[7] but a whole African council at once; who, in return to Nova-

[1] Cornel. Ep. ad Fabium, ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. [2] Bishop Burnet, Letter iv. p. 207. [3] Basnag. Exerc. ad Annal. Baron. an. 44. p. 532. [4] Cypr. Epist. 55. al. 59, ad Cornel. p. 129. Unus in Ecclesiâ ad tempus Sacerdos, et ad tempus Judex vice Christi. [5] Id. Epist. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 104. Cùm post primum secundus esse non possit, quisquis post unum, qui solus esse debeat, factus est, non jam secundus ille, sed nullus est. [6] Ibid. p. 112. Nisi si Episcopus tibi videtur, qui, Episcopo in Ecclesiâ à sedecim Coepiscopis facto, adulter atque extraneus, Episcopus fieri à desertoribus per ambitum nititur. [7] Cypr. Ep. 67. al. 68. ad Steph. p. 177. Se foris esse cœpisse, nec posse à quoquam nostrum sibi communicari; qui, Episcopo Cornelio in Catholicâ Ecclesiâ de Dei judicio, et cleri ac plebis suffragio ordinato, profanum altare erigere, adulteram cathedram collocare, et sacrilega contra verum Sacerdotem sacrificia offerre tentaverit.

tian's communicatory letter, which (according to custom) he wrote to them upon his ordination, sent him this plain and positive answer: "That he was an alien, and that none of them could communicate with him, who had attempted to erect a profane altar, and set up an adulterous chair, and offer sacrilegious sacrifice against Cornelius, the true bishop; who had been ordained by the approbation of God, and the suffrage of the clergy and people. There were, indeed, some confessors at Rome, who at first sided with Novatian; but Cyprian[1] wrote a remonstrating letter to them, wherein he soberly laid before them the sinfulness of their practice; and his admonition wrought so effectually on some of the chief of them, that not long after they returned to Cornelius, and publicly confessed their fault in these words: "We acknowledge our error; we have been imposed upon and deluded by treacherous and deceitful words; for though we seemed to communicate with a schismatical and heretical man, yet our mind was always sincerely in the Church; for we are not ignorant,[2] that as there is but one God, one Christ the Lord, and one Holy Spirit, so there ought to be but one bishop in a catholic Church." Pamelius[3] and others who take this for a confession of the bishop of Rome's supremacy, betray either gross ignorance, or great partiality for a cause; for though this was spoken of a bishop of Rome, yet it was not peculiar to him, but the common case of bishops in all Churches. Ignatius, and all the writers after him, who have said any thing of bishops, always speak of a single bishop in every Church. And though[4] Origen seems to say otherwise, that there were two bishops in every Church; yet as he explains his own notion, his meaning is the same with all the rest; for he says, "the one was visible, the other invisible; the one an angel, the other a man." So that his testimony (though

[1] Cypr. Ep. 44. al. 46. ad Nicostrat. et Maxim. [2] Cornel. Ep. 46. ad Cyprian. Nec enim ignoramus unum Deum esse, unum Christum Dominum, quem confessi sumus, unum Spiritum Sanctum, unum Episcopum in Catholicâ Ecclesiâ esse debere. [3] Pamel. Not. in Loc. [4] Orig. Hom. 13. in Luc. Per singulas Ecclesias bini sunt Episcopi, alius visibilis, alius invisibilis. ——— Ego puto inveniri simul posse et Angelum et Hominem bonos (leg. binos) Ecclesiæ Episcopos.

there be something peculiar in his notion) is a further confirmation of the Church's practice.

The writers of the following ages do so frequently mention the same thing, that it would be as tedious, as it is needless, to recite their[1] testimonies. Therefore I shall only add these two things. First, that the council of Nice repeats and confirms this ancient rule: for in the eighth canon, which speaks of the Novatian bishops that return to the Catholic Church, it is said, that any bishop may admit them to officiate as presbyters in the city, or as *Chorepiscopi* in the country, but not as city bishops, for this reason, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο ἐπισκοποι ὦσιν, *that there may not be two bishops in one city.* Secondly, that in fact the people were generally possessed with the opinion of the absolute unlawfulness of having two bishops sit together: insomuch that Theodoret tells[2] us, when Constantius proposed to the Roman people to have Liberius and Felix sit as co-partners, and govern the Church in common, they unanimously agreed to reject the motion, crying out, "One God, one Christ, one Bishop!"

SECT. 2.—Yet Two Bishops sometimes allowed by Compromise, to end a Dispute, or cure an inveterate Schism.

Yet it must be observed, that as the great end and design of this rule was to prevent schism, and preserve the peace and unity of the Church; so, on the other hand, when it manifestly appeared, that the allowing of two bishops in one city, in some certain circumstances and critical junctures, was the only way to put an end to some long and inveterate schism; in that case there were some catholic bishops, who were willing to take a partner into their throne, and share the episcopal power and dignity between them. Thus Meletius, bishop of Antioch, made the proposal to Paulinus his antagonist, who though he was of the same faith, yet kept up a Church divided in communion from him. I shall relate the

[1] See Chrysost. Epist. 125. ad Cyriac. et Hom. 1. in Philip. Jerom Epist. 4. ad Rustic. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Com. in Tit. 2. Pseudo-Hieron. Com. in 1 Tim. c. 3. 12. Hilar. Diac. Com. in Phil. i. 1. It. in 1 Cor. xii. 28. et in 1 Tim. iii. 12. Pacian. Ep. 3 ad Sempronian. Socrat. lib. vi. c. 22. Sozom. lib. iv. c. 14 et 15. Theod. lib. iii. c. 4. [2] Theod. lib. ii. c. 17.

proposal in the words[1] of Theodoret. "Meletius", says he, "the meekest of men, thus friendly and mildly addressed himself to Paulinus;"—'Forasmuch as the Lord hath committed to me the care of these sheep, and thou hast received the care of others, and all the sheep agree in one common faith, let us join our flocks, my friend, and dispute no longer about primacy and government; but let us feed the sheep in common, and bestow a common care upon them. [2] And if it be the throne that creates the dispute, I will try to take away that cause also. We will lay the Holy Gospel upon the seat, and then each of us take his place on either side of it. And if I die first, you shall take the government of the flock alone, but if it be your fate to die before me, then I will feed them according to my power.' "Thus spake the divine Meletius," says our author, "lovingly and meekly; but Paulinus would not acquiesce, nor hearken to him."

We meet with another such proposal made to the Donatist bishops, by all the catholic bishops of Afric assembled together, at the opening of the famous conference of Carthage. There they offered them freely before the conference began, "that if they would return to the unity and communion of the Church, upon due conviction, they should retain their[3] episcopal honour and dignity still;" and because this could not be done, as the circumstances and case of the Church then were, without allowing two bishops for

---

[1] Theod. lib. v. c. 3. [2] Ἐι δὲ ὁ μέσος θῶκος τὴν ἔριν γεννᾷ, ἐγὼ ἡ ταύτην ἐξελάσαι πειρασομαι. ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ τὸ θεῖον προτεθεικως ἐυαγγέλιον, ἐκατέρωθεν ἡμᾶς καθῆσθαι παρεγγύω. [3] Collat. Carth. l. die. c. 16. Sic nobiscum teneant Unitatem, ut non solùm viam salutis inveniant, sed nec honorem Episcopatûs amittant. ——— Poterit quippe unusquisque nostrûm, Honoris sibi socio copulato, vicissim sedere eminentiùs, sicut peregrino Episcopo juxta considente Collegâ. Hoc cum alternis basilicis utrisque conceditur, uterque ab alterutro honore mutuo prævenitur: Quia ubi præceptis charitatis dilataverit corda, possessio pacis non fit angusta, ut uno eorum defuncto, deinceps jam singulis singuli, pristino more, succedant. Nec novum aliquid fiet: Nam hoc ab ipsius separationis exordio, in eis qui damnato nefariæ discessionis errore, unitatis dulcedinem vel serò sapuerunt, Catholica dilectio custodivit. Aut si fortè Christiani Populi singulis delectantur Episcopis, et duorum consortium, inusitatâ rerum facie, tolerare non possunt: Utrique de medio secedamus; et Ecclesiis in singulis, damnatâ schismatis causâ, in unitate pacificâ constitutis, ab his qui singuli in Ecclesiis singulis invenientur, unitati factæ per longa necessaria singuli constituantur Episcopi.

ome time to be in the same city, it was further proposed; that every catholic bishop should take the other to be his opartner and share the honour with him; allowing him to t with him in his own chair, as was usual for bishops to eat their fellow bishops that were strangers; and also ranting him a Church of his own, where he might be capale of returning him the like civility; that so they might ay mutual respect and honour to each other, and take ıeir turns to sit highest in the Church, till such time as ne of them should die; and then the right of succession hould be always in a single bishop, as it was before." "And his," they say, "was no new thing in Afric; for from the eginning of the schism, they that would recant their error nd condemn their separation, and return to the unity of ıe Church, were by the charity of Catholics always treated ı the same courteous manner." From hence it is plain, that his had been the practice of Afric for above one whole cenury; and the present bishops proposed to follow the exmple of their predecessors, in making this concession to he Donatists, in order to close up and heal the divisons of he Church. But they add, "that forasmuch as this method night not be acceptable to all Christian people, who would ıe much better pleased to see only a single bishop in every Church, and perhaps would not endure the partnership of wo, which was an unusal thing; they therefore proposed n this case, that both the bishops should freely resign, and uffer a single bishop to be chosen by such bishops as were ingly possessed of other Churches." So that at once they estify both what was the usual and ordinary rule of the Church, to have but one bishop in a city, and also how far hey were willing to have receded, in order to establish the peace and unity of the Church in that extraordinary juncture. I have been the more easily tempted to recite this passage ıt large, not only because it is a full proof of all that has been asserted in this chapter, but because it gives us such ın instance of a noble, self-denying zeal and charity as is scarce to be paralleled in any history; and shows us the admirable spirit of those holy bishops, among whom St. Austin was a leader.

SECT. 3.—The Opinions of Learned Men concerning two Bishops in a City in the Apostolical Age, one of the Jews, and the other of the Gentiles.

Some very learned[1] persons are further of opinion, that this rule about one bishop in a city, did not take place in the apostolical age; for they think that before the perfect incorporation and coalition of Jews and Gentiles into one body, there were two bishops in many cities, one of the Jews, and another of the Gentiles. Thus they think it was at Antioch, where Euodius and Ignatius are said to be bishops, ordained by the Apostles; as also Linus and Clemens, at Rome, the one ordained by St. Peter, bishop of the Jews, and the other by St. Paul, bishop of the Gentiles. Epiphanius seems to have been of this opinion; for he says,[2] Peter and Paul were the first bishops of Rome; and he makes it a question, whether they did not ordain two other bishops to supply their places in their absence. In another place[3] he takes occasion to say, "that Alexandria never had two bishops, as other Churches had;" which observation, bishop Pearson thinks, ought to be extended to the apostolical ages, as implying that St. Mark, being the only preacher of the Gospel at Alexandria, left but one bishop his successor; but in other Churches, sometimes two Apostles gathered Churches, and each of them left a bishop in his place. Yet this does not satisfy other learned persons,[4] who are of a different judgment, and think, that though the Apostles had occasion to ordain two bishops in some cities, yet it was not upon the account of different Churches of Jews and Gentiles, but in the ordinary way of succession, as Ignatius was ordained at Antioch after the death of Euodius, and Clemens, at Rome, after the death of Linus. I shall not pretend to determine on which side the right lies in so nice a dispute,[5] but leave it to the judicious reader, and only say, that if the former opinion prevails, it proves another exception to the common rule of having but one bishop in a city; or rather shows what was the practice of the Church before the rule was made.

---

[1] Pearson. Vind. Ignat. par. ii. c. 13. p. 414. Hammond Dissert. 5. adv. Blondel. c. 1. [2] Epiphan. Hær. 27, Carpocrat. n. 6. [3] Idem Hær. 68. Meletian. n. 6. [4] Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. lib. vii. c. 46. [5] Bishop Pearson himself altered his opinion. See his Dissert. 2. de Successione Rom. Pontif. c. 3.

SECT. 4.—The Case of Coadjutors.

To these we may add a third exception, in a case that is more plain; which was that of the coadjutors. These were such bishops as were ordained to assist some other bishops in case of infirmity or old age, and were to be subordinate to them as long as they lived, and succeed them when they died. Thus, when Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem, was disabled, by reason of his great age, (being a hundred and twenty years old,) Alexander was made his coadjutor. Eusebius[1] and St. Jerom both say it was done by revelation; but they do not mean that Narcissus needed a revelation to authorize him to take a coadjutor, but only to point out to him that particular man. For Alexander was a stranger, and a bishop already in another country, so that without a revelation he could not have been judged qualified for this office; but being once declared to be so, there was no scruple upon any other account; but by the unanimous consent[2] of all the bishops in Palestine, he was chosen to take part with Narcissus in the care and government of the Church. Valesius[3] reckons this the first instance of any coadjutor to be met with in ancient history; but there are several examples in the following ages. Theotecnus, bishop of Cæsarea, made Anatolius his coadjutor, designing him to be his successor, so that for some time they[4] both governed the same Church together. Maximus[5] is said by Sozomen to be bishop of Jerusalem together with Macarius. Orion, bishop of Palæbisca, being grown old, ordained Siderius his coadjutor and successor, as Synesius[6] informs us. So Theodoret[7] takes notice that John, bishop of Apamea, had one Stephen for his colleague. And St. Ambrose[8] mentions one Senecio, who was coadjutor to Bassus. In the same manner, Gregory Nazianzen was

---

[1] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 11. [2] Hieron. de Script. Eccl. in Alexandro. Cunctis in Palæstinâ Episcopis in unum congregatis, adnitente quoque ipso vel maximè Narcisso, Hierosolymitanæ Ecclesiæ cum eo gubernaculum suscepit. [3] Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. vi. c. 11. [4] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 32. Ἀμφω τῆς ἀυτῆς πρώτησαν ἐκκλησίας. [5] Sozom. lib. ii. c. 20. [6] Synes. Ep. 67. [7] Theod. lib. v. c. 4. [8] Ambr. 79. ad. Theophil. Fratri nostro et Coepiscopo Basso in Consortium regendæ Ecclesiæ datus est Senecio.

bishop of Nazianzum, together with his aged father. Baronius,[1] indeed, denies that ever he was bishop of Nazianzum; but St. Jerom,[2] and all the ancient historians, Socrates,[3] Sozomen,[4] Ruffin,[5] and Theodoret,[6] expressly assert it; though some of them mistake in calling him his father's successor; for he was no otherwise bishop of Nazianzum, but only as his father's coadjutor. He entered upon the office with this protestation, "That he would not be obliged to continue bishop there any longer than his father lived," as he himself acquaints[7] us in his own life, and other places. So that, after his father's death, he actually resigned; and getting Eulalius to be ordained in his room, he betook himself[8] to a private life; all which evidently proves that he was not his father's successor, but only his coadjutor. I will but add one instance more of this nature, which is the known case of St. Austin, who was ordained bishop of Hippo whilst Valerius was living, and sat with him[9] for some time, as his coadjutor; which he did by the consent of the primate of Carthage, and the primate of Numidia, who ordained him. Possidius says "he had some scruple upon him at first, because he looked upon it as contrary to the custom of the Church; but being told, that it was a thing commonly practised both in the African and Transmarine Churches, he yielded, with some reluctancy, to be ordained." These instances are evident proof that it was not thought contrary to the true sense of the canon, in case of infirmity or old age, to have coadjutors in the Church. Though, it is true, St. Austin was of opinion that his own ordination was not regular, when afterward he came to know the Nicene canon, which he did not know before; and, for this reason, he would not ordain Eradius[10] bishop whilst he himself lived, though he had nominated him, with the consent of the Church, to be his

---

[1] Baron. an. 371. n. 106. [2] Hieron. de Script. Eccl. Gregorius primum Sasimorum, deinde Nazianzenus Episcopus, &c. [3] Socrat. lib. iv. c. 26. [4] Sozom. lib. vi. c. 17. [5] Ruffin. lib. ii. c. 9. [6] Theod. lib. v. c. 8. [7] Naz. Carm. de Vita sua. It. Orat. 8. ad Patr. [8] Naz. Ep. 42. ad Greg. Nyss. [9] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 8. Paulin. Ep. 46. ad Roman. Aug. Ep. 84 et 110. [10] Aug. Ep. 110. Quod reprehensum est in me, nolo reprehendi in filio meo. Exit Presbyter ut est, quando Deus voluerit futurus Episcopus.

successor. But all men did not understand the canon in this strict and rigorous sense that St. Austin did, as absolutely forbidding two bishops to be in a Church at the same time, in all cases whatsoever, but only when there was no just reason, and the necessities of the Church did not require it. But if there was a reasonable cause to have more bishops than one, as when a bishop was unable to execute his office, or in any the like case, the canon did not oblige, as appears from the instances that have been mentioned, and several others that might be added to them.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the Chorepiscopi, Περιοδευταὶ, *and Suffragan Bishops; and how these differed from one another.*

Sect. 1.—Of the Reason of the Name *Chorepiscopi*, and the Mistake of some about it.

As the bishops, when they were disabled by old age or infirmity, ordained themselves coadjutors in the city; so when their dioceses were enlarged, by the conversion of pagans, in the country and villages at a great distance from the city-church, they created themselves another sort of assistants in the country, whom they called *Chorepiscopi;* who were so named, not because they were *ex choro sacerdotum*, as a Latin writer,[1] by mistake, derives the word, but because they were τῆς χώρας ἐπίσκοποι, *country-bishops*, as the word properly signifies, and not presbyters of the city regions, as Salmasius understands it.

Sect. 2.—Three different Opinions about the Nature of this Order: 1st. That they were mere Presbyters.

Now, though the name does in some measure determine their quality, yet great dispute has been among learned men, concerning the nature of this order. Among the school-men and canonists it is a received opinion, that they

[1] Raban. Maur. de Instit. Sacerd. lib. i. c. 5. Salmas. de Primat. c. 1.

were only presbyters; as may be seen in Turrian,[1] Estius,[2] Antonius Augustinus,[3] and Gratian,[4] who are followed not only by Salmasius,[5] but by Spalatensis,[6] Dr. Field,[7] and Dr. Forbes,[8] the last of which brings several arguments to prove that they were mere presbyters, and never had any episcopal ordination.

SECT. 3.—A second Opinion, that some of them were Presbyters, and some of them Bishops.

Others think there were two sorts of *Chorepiscopi*, some that had episcopal ordination, and others that were simple presbyters; which is the opinion of Cabassutius,[9] Peter de Marca,[10] and Bellarmin.[11] They all allow, that in some cases, it happened that the *Chorepiscopi* were bishops, because they were ordained bishops before they were made *Chorepiscopi*. And thus much is certainly true; for in the primitive Church sometimes, bishops were ordained to a place, but not received, either through the perversenes of the people, or by reason of persecution, or the like cause; and such bishops (whom the ancient writers[12] and canons term σχολαῖοι and σχολάζοντες ἐπίσκοποι, *vacant bishops*,) not being permitted to officiate in their own Church, were admitted to act as *Chorepiscopi* under any other bishop that would entertain them. The council of Nice[13] made the like provision for such of the Novatian bishops as would return to the Catholic Church; "that the bishop of the place should admit them either to the office of a city-presbyter, or a *Chorepiscopus*; that there might not be two bishops in one city." And so it was determined likewise, by the same council,[14] in the case of the Meletian bishops, "that upon their return to the unity of the Church, they should be allowed to officiate in subordination to the bishops of the Catholic

[1] Turrian. Not. in Can. 54. Con. Nic. Arabic. [2] Est. in 4. Sent. Dist. xxxiv. sect. 30. [3] Ant. August. Epit. Jur. Can. lib. vi. Tit. i. c. 8. 11. 13. [4] Grat. Dist. vi. c. 4, 5. [5] Wallo Messalin. c. 5. p. 315. [6] Spalat. de Repub. par. i. lib. ii. c. 9. n. 17, 18, 19. [7] Field of the Church, lib. v. c. 29. [8] Forb. Iren. lib. ii. c. 11. Prop. 14. p. 249. [9] Cabassut. Notit. Concil. c. 8. p. 45. [10] Pet. de Marca de Concord. lib. ii. c. 13. [11] Bellarm. de Cleric. lib. i. c. 17. [12] Socrat. H. E. lib. iv. c. 7. Conc. Antioch. can. 16. [13] Conc. Nic. can. 8. [14] Conc. Nic. Ep. Synod. ap. Socrat. H. E. lib. i. c. 9.

Church." Now it is plain, that all such *Chorepiscopi* as these were properly bishops, because they were originally ordained bishops before they came to act in the quality of country-bishops under others. But for all the rest, de Marca thinks they were only presbyters.

SECT. 4.—The third Opinion, that they were all Bishops, the most probable.

Both these opinions (which differ little from one another) are rejected by Bp. Barlow,[1] Dr. Hammond,[2] Dr. Beveregge,[3] Dr. Cave,[4] and even by Mr. Blondel[5] himself, who, though by some reckoned among those of the contrary opinion, has a long dissertation against de Marca, to prove that all the *Chorepiscopi*, mentioned in the ancient councils, were properly bishops. And there needs no fuller proof of this, than what Athanasius says in his second Apology; where he puts a manifest distinction betwixt presbyters and the *Chorepiscopi*. For, speaking of the irregular promotion of Ischyras, who was made bishop of the region of Mareotis by the Eusebian faction, he says, "Mareotis was only a region of Alexandria, and that all the Churches of that precinct were immediately subject to the bishop of Alexandria, and never had either bishop or *Chorepiscopus*[6] among them, but only presbyters, fixed each in their respective villages or Churches." This, as Blondel[7] well observes, shows evidently, that the *Chorepiscopi* were not the same with presbyters; however the forger of the Decretal Epistles, under the name of Pope Leo and Damasus, would have persuaded the world to believe so.

SECT. 5.—Some Objections against this answered.

But why then does the council of Neocæsarea[8] say, that the *Chorepiscopi* were only in imitation of the seventy? I answer, because they were subject to the city-bishops, as

---

[1] Barlow's Letter to Bishop Usher in Ush. Let. ccxxii. p. 520. [2] Ham. Dissert. 3. cont. Blondel. c. 8. [3] Bevereg. Pandect. 2. Not. in Conc. Ancyr. can. 13. [4] Cave Prim. Christ. par. i. c. 8. p. 224.
[5] Blondel. Apol. p. 95, &c. [6] Athan. Apol. ii. tom. 1. p. 802. [7] Blondel. Apol. p. 127. Non unum cum Presbyteris Chorepiscopos fuisse, aut eandem formam gestasse, prout Decretalium suppositori somniare visum est.
[8] Conc. Neocæsar. can. 14. Χωρεπίσκοποι εἰσὶ μὲν εἰς τύπον τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα.

the seventy elders were subject to Moses, or the seventy disciples to the Apostles. For whatever the council means by the seventy, it cannot be proved thence that the *Chorepiscopi* were mere presbyters.

But it is said, that they could not be bishops, because the ordination of bishops was to be performed by three bishops, with the consent of the metropolitan and the provincial bishops; whereas the council of Antioch[1] says, "That a *Chorepiscopus* was ordained by one bishop only, the bishop of the city, to whose jurisdiction he belonged." To this the reply is easy,—that this was one principal difference between the city-bishops and country-bishops, who differed both in the manner of their ordination, and in their power; for the one was subordinate to the other. Therefore those canons which require three bishops to impose hands in the ordination of a bishop, speak only of such bishops as were to be absolute and supreme governors of their own diocese, and not of such who were subordinate to them, whom the city-bishops might ordain at their own discretion, yet so as to stand accountable to a provincial synod.

SECT. 6.—The *Chorepiscopi* allowed to ordain the inferior Clergy, but not Presbyters or Deacons, without special License from the City-Bishop.

The office of these *Chorepiscopi* was to preside over the country clergy, and inquire into their behaviour, and make report thereof to the city-bishop; as also to provide fit persons for the inferior service and ministry of the Church. And, to give them some authority, they had certain privileges conferred on them; as, 1st. They might ordain readers, sub-deacons, and exorcists, for the use of the country-churches. St. Basil[2] requires of his *Chorepiscopi*, that they should first acquaint him with the qualification of such persons, and take his license to ordain them. But the council of Antioch[3] gives them a general commission to ordain all under presbyters and deacons, without consulting the city-bishop upon every such promotion: and for presbyters and deacons, they might ordain them too, but not

[1] Concil. Antioch. can. 10. [2] Basil. Epist. 181. [3] Conc. Antioch. can. 10.

δίχα τῆς ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπισκόπου, without the special leave of the city-bishop, under whose jurisdiction both they and the country were. And this is the meaning of the council of Ancyra,[1] which says, "The *Chorepiscopi* shall not have power to ordain presbyters or deacons;" which we must interpret by the explication given in the council of Antioch, that they should not be authorized to do it, without the particular direction of the city-bishop; but by his leave they might.

SECT. 7.—They had Power to confirm.

2dly. They had power to minister confirmation to such as were newly baptized in country-churches. This is expressly provided by the council of Riez,[2] in the case of Armentarius, whom they reduced to the quality of a *Chorepiscopus*, but still allowed him the privilege of confirming neophytes; which argues, that confirmation might then be administered by the hands of the *Chorepiscopi* in country-churches.

SECT. 8.—And Power to grant Letters Dimissory to the Clergy.

3dly. They had power to grant letters dimissory, or, as they were otherwise called, canonical and irenical letters, to the country-clergy, who desired to remove from one diocese to another. Thus I understand that canon of the council of Antioch,[3] which says, "Country-presbyters shall not grant *canonical letters, κανονικὰς ἐπιστολὰς*, or send letters to any neighbour-bishop; but the *Chorepiscopi* may grant *εἰρηνικὰς, letters dimissory,* or *letters of peace.*

SECT. 9.—They had Power to officiate in the Presence of the City-Bishop.

4thly. They had liberty to officiate in the city-church, in the presence of the bishop and presbyters of the city, which country-presbyters had not; for so the council of Neocæsarea determined in two canons to this purpose:[4] "The country presbyters shall not offer the oblation, nor distribute the bread and wine, in time of prayer, in the city-church, when the bishop and presbyters are present; but

[1] Con. Ancyr. can. 14. [2] Conc. Reiens. c. 3. [3] Con. Antioch. can. 8. [4] Con. Neocæs. can. 13 et 14.

the country-bishops being in imitation of the seventy, as fellow-labourers, for their care of the poor, are admitted to offer."

SECT. 10.—And to sit and vote in Council.

5thly. They had the privilege of sitting and voting in synods and councils; of which there are several instances still remaining in the acts of the ancient councils. In the first Nicene council,[1] Palladius and Seleucius subscribe themselves *Chorepiscopi* of the province of Cœlosyria; Eudæmon, *Chorepiscopus* of the province of Cilicia; Gorgonius, Stephanus, Euphronius, Rhodon, Theophanes, *Chorepiscopi* of the province of Cappadocia; Hesychius, Theodore, Anatolius, Quintus, Aquila, *hCorepiscopi* of the province of Isauria; Theustinus and Eulalius, of the province of Bithynia. So again, in the council of Neocæsarea,[2] Stephanus and Rudus, or Rhodon, two of the same that were in the council of Nice, subscribed themselves *Chorepiscopi* of the province of Cappadocia. And in the council of Ephesus,[3] Cæsarius, *Chorepiscopus* of Alce.

SECT. 11.—The Power of the *Chorepiscopi* not the same in all Times and Places.

But here I must observe, that the power and privileges of the *Chorepiscopi* varied much, according to the difference of times and places; for when the synod of Riez in France, Anno, 439, had deposed Armentarius from his bishopric, because he was uncanonically ordained, they allowed him the privilege of being a *Chorepiscopus*, after the example of the Nicene fathers, but limited him as to the exercise of his power. For though they gave him authority to confirm neophytes, and consecrate virgins, and celebrate the eucharist in any country-church, with preference to any presbyter of the region, yet, 1st. they denied him[4] the privilege of consecrating the eucharist in the city-church, which, by the thirteenth canon of the council of Neocæsarea, was allowed to other *Chorepiscopi:* 2dly, they confined him to a single Church in the exercise of his *Chorepiscopal* power;

[1] Con. Nic. I. in Subscription. [2] Con. Neocæs. in Subscription.
[3] Con. Ephes. Act. I. [4] Conc. Reiens. can. 3.

whereas, others had power over a whole region: 3dly, they forbad him to ordain any of the inferior clergy, even in his own Church, which other *Chorepiscopi* were allowed to do by the thirteenth canon of the council of Ancyra; and hence it appears, that as their power was precarious, and depending upon the will of councils and city-bishops, from whom they received it, so by this time their authority began to sink apace in the Church.

SECT. 12.—Their Power first struck at by the Council of Laodicea, which set up Περιοδευταὶ in their Room.

The council of Laodicea gave them the first blow, Anno, 360; for there it was decreed,[1] "that for the future no bishops should be placed in country villages, but only Περιοδευταὶ, *itinerant* or *visiting presbyters;* and for such bishops as were already constituted, they should do nothing without the consent and direction of the city-bishop." In the council of Chalcedon we meet with some such presbyters expressly styled Περιοδευταὶ, as Alexander[2] and Valentinus,[3] each of which has the title of presbyter and Περιοδευτὴς; and so in the fifth general-council at Constantinople,[4] one Sergius, a presbyter, has the same title of Περιοδευτὴς, *curator* or *visitor* of the Syrian churches; yet still the order of the *Chorepiscopi* was preserved in many places, for not only mention is made of them by Gregory Nazianzen,[5] and St. Basil, in the fourth century, but also by Theodoret,[6] who speaks of Hypatius and Abramius, his own *Chorepiscopi*. And in the council of Chalcedon, in the fifth century, we find the *Chorepiscopi* sitting and subscribing in the name of the bishops that sent them; but this was some diminution of their power, for in former councils they subscribed in their own names, as learned men[7] agree: but now their power was sinking, and it went on to decay and dwindle by degrees, till at last, in the ninth century, when the forged Decretals were set on foot, it was pretended that they were not true bishops, and

[1] Con. Laod. can. 57. [2] Con. Chalced. Act. 4. [3] Ibid. Act. 10. [4] Con. C. P. sub Menna. Act. 1. p. 563. [5] Nazian. Ep. 88. Theodoro. Basil. Ep. 181. [6] Theod. Ep. 113. ad Leon. [7] Blondel. Apol. p. 131. Beveregg. Not. in Con. Ancyr. c. 13.

The author is evidently mistaken, when he calls this the first

so the order, by the Pope's tyranny came to be laid aside in the western Church.

SECT. 13.—Of the Attempt to restore the *Chorepiscopi* in England, under the Name of Suffragan Bishops.

Some attempt was made in England at the beginning of the Reformation, to restore these under the name of suffragan bishops; for, as our histories inform us,[1] by an act of the 26th of Henry the VIIIth, Anno, 1534, several towns were appointed for suffragan sees, viz. Thetford, Ipswich, Colchester, Dover, Guildford, Southampton, Taunton, Shaftsbury, Molton, Marlborough, Bedford, Leicester, Gloucester, Shrewsbury, Bristol, Penreth, Bridgewater, Nottingham, Grantham, Hull, Huntingdon, Cambridge, Pereth, Berwick, St. Germains in Cornwall, and the Isle of Wight. These suffragans were to be consecrated by the archbishop, and two other bishops, and by the act to have the same episcopal power as suffragans formerly had within this realm; but none of them either to have or act any thing properly episcopal, without the consent and permission of the bishop of the city, in whose diocese he was placed and constituted. Now any one that compares this with the account that I have given of the ancient *Chorepiscopi*, will easily perceive that these suffragans were much of the same nature with them; but then I must observe that this was a new name for them.

SECT. 14.—Suffragan Bishops different from the *Chorepiscopi* in the Primitive Church.

For anciently suffragan bishops were all the city-bishops of any province under a metropolitan; who were called his suffragans, because they met at his command to give their suffrage, counsel, or advice in a provincial synod, and in this sense, the word was used in England at the time when Linwood wrote his Provinciale, which was not above an hundred years before the Reformation, Anno, 1430. In his comment upon one of the constitutions of John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury, which begins with these words, "*Omnibus, et singulis Coepiscopis suffraganeis nostris;*" *to all and*

[1] Burnet Hist. of Refor. vol. ii. p. 157.

singular our fellow-bishops and suffragans;" upon this word suffragans he has this note:[1] "They were called suffragans, because they were bound to give their suffrage and assistance to the archbishop, being summoned to take part in his care, though not in the plenitude of his power." Whence it is plain, that in his time suffragan bishops did not signify *Chorepiscopi*, or rural bishops, but all the bishops of England under their archbishops or metropolitans. Thus it was also in other Churches: the seventy bishops who were immediately subject to the bishop of Rome, as their primate or metropolitan, were called his suffragans, because they were frequently called to his synods; as the reason of the name is given in an ancient Vatican MS. cited by Baronius.[2]

SECT. 15.—The Suffragan Bishops of the Roman Provinces called by a technical Name, *Libra*.

And here it will not be amiss to observe, whilst we are speaking of suffragan bishops, that these seventy bishops, who were suffragans to the bishop of Rome, were by a peculiar technical name called *Libra;* which name was given them for no other reason, but because of their number seventy. For the Roman *libra,* as antiquaries[3] note, consisted of seventy *solidi,* or so many parts; and therefore the number seventy, in any other things, or persons, thence took the name of *libra;* as the seventy witnesses, which are introduced deposing against Marcellinus, in the council of Sinuessa, that they saw him sacrifice, are by the author of those acts,[4] termed *libra occidua,* for no other reason, as Baronius[5] conceives, but because they were seventy in number. And Grotius[6] gives the same reason for affixing this

---

[1] Linwood Provinc. lib. 1. tit. ii. c. 1. Suffraganeis. Sic dictis, quia Archiepiscopo suffragari et assistere tenentur, &c. [2] Baron. an. 1057. n. 23. Præter septem collaterales Episcopos erant alii Episcopi, qui dicuntur Suffraganei Romani Pontificis, nulli alii Primati vel Archiepiscopo subjecti, qui frequenter ad Synodos vocarentur. [3] Brerewood de Ponder. et Pret. c. 15. [4] Concil. Sinuess. ap. Crab. t. i. p. 190. Hi omnes electi sunt viri, Libra Occidua, qui testimonium perhibent, videntes Marcellinum thurificâsse. [5] Baron. an. 302. n. 92. [6] Grot. in Luc. 10. 1. Romanis Episcopis jam olim septuaginta Episcopi adsessores Libra dicti, quòd libra Romana tot solidos contineret.

title on the seventy bishops, who were assessors or suffragans to the bishop of Rome; they were, as one might say, his *Libra*, or ordinary provincial council.

CHAP. XV.

Of the Intercessores and Interventores in the African Churches.

SECT. 1.—Why some Bishops called Intercessors in the African Churches.

There is one appellation more given to some bishops in the African councils, which must here be taken notice of, whilst we are speaking of bishops, which is the name intercessor and interventor; a title given to some bishops upon the account of a *pro-tempore* office, which was sometimes committed to them. In the African Churches, and perhaps in others also, upon the vacancy of a bishopric, it was usual for the primate to appoint one of the provincial bishops to be a sort of procurator of the diocese; partly, to take care of the vacant see; and partly, to promote and procure the speedy election of a new bishop: and from this he had the name of intercessor and interventor.

SECT. 2.—The Office of an Intercessor not to last above a Year.

The design of this office was manifestly to promote the good of the Church, but it was liable to be abused two ways; for the intercessor, by this means, had a fair opportunity given to ingratiate himself with the people, and promote his own interest among them, instead of that of the Church; either by keeping the see void longer than was necessary; or if it was a wealthier, or more honourable place than his own, by getting himself chosen into it. To obviate any such designs, the African fathers, in the fifth council of Carthage, made a decree, that no intercessor should continue in his office for above a year; but if he did not procure a new bishop to be chosen within that time, another intercessor should be sent in his room.

SECT. 3.—No Intercessor to be made Bishop of the Place where he was constituted Intercessor.

And the more effectually to cut off all abuses, and pre-

vent corruption, they enacted it also into a law,[1] that no intercessor should be capable of succeeding himself in the vacant see, whatever motions or solicitations were made by the people in his behalf. So extremely cautious were these holy African fathers to prevent abuses in matters of this nature.

CHAP. XVI.

Of Primates or Metropolitans.

Sect. 1.—Some derive the original of Metropolitans from Apostolical Constitution.

The same reasons which first brought in *Chorepiscopi*, and coadjutors, as subordinate to bishops in every city-church, made the bishops of every province think it necessary to make one of themselves superior to all the rest, and invest him with certain powers and privileges for the good of the whole; whom they therefore named their primate or metropolitan, that is, the principal bishop of the province. Bishop Usher[2] derives the origin of this settlement from apostolical constitution; so also bishop Beverege,[3] Dr. Hammond,[4] Peter de Marca, and some others; and there are several passages in Eusebius and Chrysostom which seem to favour this: for Eusebius[5] says, "Titus had the superintendency of all the Churches in Crete;" and Chrysostom in like manner,[6] "that the Apostle committed to him the whole island, and gave him power to censure all the bishops therein." He says the same of Timothy,[7] "that he was entrusted with the government of the Church in the whole region or province of Asia." And it is certain, the Cyprian bishops in the

---

[1] Con. Carth. v. can. 8. Placuit, ut nulli Intercessori licitum sit, Cathedram, cui Intercessor datus est, quibuslibet populorum studiis, vel seditionibus retinere: sed dare operam, ut intra annum eisdem Episcopum provideat. Quod si neglexerit, anno expleto, Interventor alius tribuatur. [2] Usser. de Orig. Episc. et Metrop. [3] Bevereg. Cod. Can. Vind. lib. ii. c. 5. n. 12. [4] Ham. Pref. to Titus. It. Dissert. 4. cont. Blondel. c. 5. [5] Euseb. H. E. lib. iii. c. 4. Τῶν ἐπὶ Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐιληχέναι. [6] Chrys. Hom. 1. in Tit. Νῆσον ὁλόκληρον—ἐξουσίαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων κρίσιν ἐπέτρεψεν. [7] Id. Hom. 15. in 1 Tim.

council of Ephesus,[1] pleaded the privileges of their metropolitan to be as ancient as the Apostles.

SECT. 2.—Others from the Age next after the Apostles.

But it may be doubted, whether the Apostles made any such general settlement of metropolitans in every province, and the records of the original of most Churches being lost, it cannot be certainly proved they did. De Marca[2] thinks, that though the Apostles gave a model or specimen in Timothy and Titus, yet they left it to following ages to finish and complete it. Dr. Cave says,[3] "it commenced not long after the apostolic age, when sects and schisms began to break in apace; and controversies multiplying between particular bishops, it was found necessary to pitch upon one in every province, to whom the umpirage of cases might be referred, and by whom all common and public affairs might be directed." Perhaps it took its rise from that common respect and deference, which was usually paid, by the rest of the bishops, to the bishop of the civil metropolis in every province; which, advancing into a custom, was afterwards made into a canon by the council of Nice.

SECT. 3.—Confessed by all to have been long before the Council of Nice.

This is certain, that the Nicene council speaks of metropolitans as settled by ancient custom long before, when it ushers in the canon about them with, ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, *let ancient customs*[4] *be continued*, and then goes on to speak of the custom in Egypt, which was for the bishop of Alexandria to have power over all the Churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; which was metropolitical, if not patriarchal, power. Epiphanius[5] mentions the same, speaking of Alexander and Peter, bishops of Alexandria, before the council of Nice, he says, "they had ἐκκλησιαστικὴν διοίκησιν, *the administration of ecclesiastical affairs* throughout all Egypt, Thebais, Mareotes, Libya, Ammoniaca, Mareotis, and Pentapolis." And Athanasius,[6] speaking of Dio-

[1] Con. Ephes. Act. 7.
[2] Marca de Concord. lib. vi. c. 1. n. 9.
[3] Cave Anc. Ch. Gov. p. 92.
[4] Con. Nicen. can. 6.
[5] Epiphan. Hær. 68. n. 1. et Hær. 69. n. 3. p. 552.
[6] Athan. de Sentent. Dionys.

s, who was bishop of Alexandria above sixty years e this council, says, "he also enjoyed this power, g the care of the Churches of Pentapolis, and Libya, Sabellius broached his heresy; and that he wrote let- of admonition to several bishops of those parts, who n to be infected with his heresy." These are unde- e evidences that the bishops of Alexandria were not nvested with metropolitical power, by the council of , but only confirmed in those rights, which, by ancient m and prescription, they had long enjoyed. And this lso the case of other churches.

e council of Eliberis, in Spain,[1] speaks of a *Primæ dræ episcopus, a primate or bishop of the first see;* hose called the Apostles' Canons, (which were the ca- of the Greek Church in the third century,) mention a ος, or *chief bishop,* in every province, whom the rest to look upon as their head,[2] and do nothing without And it appears from several of Cyprian's epistles,[3] that ishop of Carthage had a presidency over all the other an bishops, and power to send his mandates among . And St. Austin speaks of the primate of Numidia, ell as the primate of Carthage, before the schism of the tists; and says, "they gave that for one reason of their m,[4] that the primate of Numidia was not called to and consecrate the primate of Carthage." And there- as both the same St. Austin[5] and Optatus,[6] take notice, Donatists pretending that the ordination of Cæcilian, p of Carthage, was not valid, because not performed by mate, sent for Secundus Tigisitanus, who was then te of Numidia, to ordain Majorinus in his room. Now this was transacted several years before the council of , so it proves that primates were in Afric, antecedent to stablishment of that council.

---

n. Eliber. an. 305. can. 58. [2] Can. Apost. c. 35. [3] Cypr. . ad Cornel. Per provinciam nostram hæc eadem Collegis singulis in no- perferentes, ab his quoque Fratres nostros cum literis dirigendos esse rimus. See also Ep. 40. ad Pleb. Carthag. Ep. 45. ad Cornel. Brevic. Collat. Tert. die, c. 16. [5] Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. Venientes cum Primate suo tunc Secundo Tigisitanto, &c. [6] Op . i. p. 41.

SECT. 4.—Proofs of Metropolitans in the second Century.

If we ascend higher yet, and look into the second century, there are some foot-steps of the same power, though not so evident as the former. Lyons, in France, was a metropolis in the civil account, and Irenæus, who was bishop of it, is said to have the superintendency of the Gallican *paræciæ*, or *dioceses*, as Eusebius[1] words it. Philip, bishop of Gortyna, in Crete, is styled by Dionysius,[2] of Corinth, bishop of all the Cretian Churches. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, presided[3] in council over all the bishops of Asia; Palmas, bishop of Amastris, over the bishops of Pontus; and Theophilus[4] of Cæsarea, with Narcissus of Jerusalem, over the rest of the bishops of Palæstine.

These are the common proofs, which are ordinarily alleged in this case; yet, I shall freely own, that the three last of them do not cogently prove the thing in dispute. For presiding in council does not necessarily infer metropolitical power; because, they might preside as senior bishops; as, Eusebius says expressly one of them did, viz. Palmas, bishop of Amastris, "*ὡς ἀρχαιότατος προστέτακτο, he presided as the most ancient bishop among them.*" Which seems to be noted by Eusebius, not without good reason: for Heracles, and not Amastris, was the civil metropolis of Pontus. Blondel, from this passage, concludes, that at this time the senior bishops in all places were the metropolitans. But this does not sufficiently appear to have been the custom any where else, but in the African Churches, of which I shall presently give an account; for the other instances that have been given, seem rather to make it evident, that the bishops of the civil metropoles were generally the primates or metropolitans in the Church also.

SECT. 5.—By what Names Metropolitans were anciently called.

It is true indeed, none of these are expressly called metropolitans: for that name scarcely occurs in any ancient record before the council of Nice; but they were at first

[1] Euseb. H. E. lib. v. c. 23. Τῶν κατα Γαλλίαν παροικιῶν, ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπισκόπει. [2] Dionys. Ep. ap. Euseb. lib. iv. c. 3. [3] Euseb. lib. v. c. 24. [4] Euseb. lib. v. c. 23.

termed Πρῶτοι and Κεφαλαὶ, *chief bishops*, and *heads of the province*, as the Apostolical Canon[1] styles them. After-ages gave them other names, as that of archbishops, at Alexandria[2] and other places, till that name became appropriate to the patriarchs. The council of Sardica[3] styles them Ἔξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας, *exarchs of the province*. St. Austin sometimes calls them *principes*,[4] *princes*; and Pope Hilary,[5] monarchs. But these being titles of grandeur, and savouring too much of absolute sovereignty and dominion, were expressly prohibited by the third council of Carthage, which ordered that no superior bishop should be called[6] high-priest or prince of the priests, but only *Primæ sedis episcopus, primate, or senior bishop*. Hence it was, that those bishops, who, in other parts of the world, were called metropolitans, in Afric had commonly the name of primates; though we sometimes meet with the name, metropolitan,[7] in the African councils also.

SECT. 6—Primates in Afric called *Senes*, because the oldest Bishop was always Metropolitan.

But these primates in Afric are frequently called *Patres Senes*. As in the African code, Xantippus primate of Numidia, is once and again[8] styled, *Senex* Xantippus; and St. Austin writing to him, inscribes his epistle,[9] *Patri et consacerdoti seni Xantippo*; and thus, in many other epistles,[10] writing to the primates, or speaking of them, he gives them the names of *Senes*. And there was a peculiar reason for giving them this name in Afric: for here the primacy was not fixed, as in other places, to the civil metropolis, but always went along with the oldest bishop of the province, who succeeded to this dignity by virtue of his

---

[1] Canon. Apost. c. 35. [2] Epiphan Hær. 68 et 69. [3] Con. Sard. can. 6. [4] Aug. Brevic. Collat. tert. die. c. 16. Non expectavit Cæcilianus, ut Princeps à Principe ordinaretur. [5] Hilar. Ep. ad Leont. Arelatens. ap. Baron. an. 462. In Provinciâ quæ ad Monarchiam tuam spectat, &c. [6] Con. Carth. 3. can. xxvi. Ut Primæ sedis Episcopus non appelletur Princeps Sacerdotum, aut Summus Sacerdos, aut aliquid hujusmodi, sed tantùm Primæ sedis Episcopus. [7] Con. Car. 3. can. 39. Carth. 4. can. 1. [8] Cod. Can. Eccl. Afr. c. 91 et 101. [9] Aug. Ep. 236. [10] Aug. Ep. 149, 152, 235, 261, &c.

seniority, whatever place he lived in. In other parts of the world the bishop of the civil metropolis was commonly metropolitan in the Church also; and so it was ordered to be by several canons, both of the eastern and western Churches. The council of Antioch[1] bids all bishops observe that the bishop of the metropolis has the care of the whole province, because all men that have business or controversies to be decided, resort from all parts to the metropolis. And the council of Turin[2] upon this foot determined a dispute about primacy betwixt the two bishops of Arles and Vienna; decreeing, "that he, that could prove his city to be the metropolis, should be the primate of the whole province." The council of Chalcedon has two canons,[3] appointing those cities to be metropoles in the Church, which were so in the civil division of the empire: and the council of Trullo[4] has one to the same purpose.

But in the African Churches it was otherwise, for they were governed by rules and canons of their own; and their rule was, to let the primacy remove from city to city, and still go along with the senior bishop, without any regard to the civil metropolis; except only at Carthage, where the bishop was a fixed and standing metropolitan for the province of Africa, properly so called. But in Numidia and Mauritania this honour was moveable; as may appear from this one instance. Constantina was the civil metropolis of Numidia, as we learn both from the ancient Notitia of the empire, and one of the canons[5] of the African code, which expressly styles it so; yet the primacy was so far from being settled here, that we never so much as find that the bishop of Constantina was at any time the primate: but in Constantine's time Secundus Tigisitanus[6] was primate of Numidia; in St. Austin's time Megalius, bishop of Calama, was primate, who by virtue of his office[7] ordained St. Austin

[1] Con. Antioch. can. 9. [2] Con. Taurin. can. 2. Qui ex iis comprobaverit suam civitatem esse Metropolim, is totius Provinciæ honorem Primatûs obtineat. [3] Con. Chalced. can. 12 et 16. [4] Con. Trull. can. 38. [5] Cod. Can. Eccl. Afr. c. 86. [6] Aug cont. Parmen. lib. 1. c. iii. Ep. 68. ad Januar. [7] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 8. Adveniente ad Ecclesiam Hipponensem tunc Primate Numidiæ Megalio Calamensi Episcopo.

bishop; afterwards Xantippus, of Tagasta,[1] succeeded by virtue of his seniority, whence he is always styled in St. Austin[2] and the African councils,[3] Senex Xantippus. This is sufficient to show that the primacy in Afric was not confined to the civil metropolis, but was always conferred upon the senior bishop, whose seniority was reckoned from the time of his consecration. Some there are who pretend to say, that these African primates notwithstanding this were subject to the bishops of the civil metropoles, who were properly the metropolitans. But there is no ground for this opinion, and it is justly exploded by de Marca[4] and others, who have occasionally touched upon this subject.

Sect. 7.—How African Bishops might forfeit their Title to the Primacy.

It is true, indeed, by the African discipline, a bishop might lose his primogeniture, and so forfeit his title to the primacy; as is evident from a passage in St. Austin,[5] which speaks of such a punishment inflicted upon one Priscus, a Mauritanian bishop, who for some misdemeanour was denied this privilege, though he still kept his bishopric. But in such cases the primacy did not devolve to the bishop of the civil metropolis, but to the next in order, who could prove himself senior by consecration.

Sect. 8.—A Register of Ordinations to be kept in the Primate's Church. And all Bishops to take place by Seniority, &c.

And because disputes sometimes arose about seniority; to prevent these, several good orders were made by the African fathers, relating to this matter. As first, that a *Matricula*, or *Archivus*, as they called it, should be kept both in the primate's Church,[6] and in the metropolis of the province, for bishops to prove the time of their ordination by.

Then, secondly, every bishop was to have his letters of

---

[1] Con. Milev. 1. in Cod. Afr. can. 84. Xantippus Primæ Sedis Numidiæ Episcopus. Aug. Ep. 217. Collega noster Xantippus Tagastensis dicit, quod sibi Primatus ipse contingat, &c. [2] Aug. Ep. 236. [3] Cod. Can. Afr. c. 91, 101. [4] Marca Dissert. de Primat. n. 3. Albaspin. Not. in Optat. lib. 1. p. 121. Stillingfleet Hist. of Separ. Par. 3. §. 9. p. 253. Pell Not. in Con. Carth. ap. Cypr. p. 230. [5] Aug. Ep. 261. Con. Milev. in Cod. Can. Afr. c. 86.

ordination subscribed by his ordainers, and dated with the year and day of his consecration.[1] Thirdly, all bishops were to take place according to seniority, and so sit and vote, and have their names subscribed in council; which was a rule not only in Afric,[2] but in all other Churches, being enacted by several[3] councils and inserted into the civil law[4] by Justinian the emperor. But they were the more nice in observing this in Afric, where the primacy went by seniority, lest the neglect of it should have bred confusion among them. Insomuch that St. Austin[5] blames Victorinus (who pretended to be primate of Numidia) only because in his *Tractoria*, or letter of summons to a provincial council, he wrote the names of the Numidian bishops in a confused order, and put Austin's name before many of his seniors; "which was a thing," he says, "equally injurious to them, and invidious to himself;" so cautious was he of doing any thing that might seem to entrench upon this rule, for fear of breeding confusion in the government of their Churches.

SECT. 9.—Three sorts of Honorary Primates, besides the Primate in Power. 1. *Primates Œvo.*

I must here take notice further, that besides the primacy of power, there was in most provinces also a primacy of honour; whence some bishops had the name and title of primates, who had not the jurisdiction. And these were of three sorts; first the *Primates Œvo*, the oldest bishop in each province next to the metropolitan. These had no power above others, except when the metropolitan was some way disabled, or unqualified for discharging his office by irregularity or suspension: then his power of course devolved to the senior bishop of the province. And this, I conceive, was the reason why the bishop of Amastris[6] presided in

[1] Con. Milev. can. 14. Placuit ut quicunque ab Episcopis ordinantur, Literas accipiant ab Ordinatoribus suis, manu eorum subscriptas, continentes Consulem et Diem, ut nulla altercatio de posterioribus vel anterioribus oriatur. [2] Con. Milev. c. 13. Posteriores anterioribus deferant, &c. Vit. Fulgentii cap. 20. Inter Episcopos, tempore Ordinationis inferior, ultimus sedebat. [3] Con. Bracar. 1. can. 24. Con. Tolet. 4. can. 3. Secundum Ordinationis suæ tempora resideant. [4] Cod. Justin. lib. 1. tit. iv. c. 40. Episcopi tempore Ordinationis prælati, &c. [5] Aug. Ep. 217. ad Victorin. [6] Euseb. lib. v. c. 23. Says he presided as the senior bishop, ὡς ἀρχαιότατος πρωτίτακτο.

council over the bishops of Pontus, when yet Heraclea, and not Amastris, was the metropolis of the province.

SECT. 10.—2. Titular Metropolitans.

The second sort of honorary primates were the titular metropolitans, which were the bishops of such cities as had the name and title of civil metropoles bestowed on them by some emperor, without the power and privileges, which were still retained to the ancient metropolis of the province. Thus Marcian, the emperor, dignified the city Chalcedon with the title of a metropolis, and the honour was confirmed to the bishop, by the council of Chalcedon[1] itself, only with a *salvo jure* to the rights of Nicomedia, the old metropolis: from that time therefore the bishop of Chalcedon styled himself metropolitan of Bythynia, as may be seen in the Acts[2] of the sixth general-council. The same honour was done to the city and bishop of Nice, in the council of Chalcedon[3] likewise. So that here were three metropolitans in one province, but one only had the power; the privileges of the other two were only honorary, to sit and vote in council next to their metropolitan. Yet this gave such bishops an opportunity to exalt themselves, and sometimes, they so far encroached upon the rights of the first metropolitan, as to draw off his suffragans, and divide the province with him. Thus it was the bishop of Nice, who before the time of the sixth general-council, had got a synod of suffragans under him; for so Photius subscribed himself in that council,[4] bishop of Nice, and metropolitan of Bythynia, for himself and the synod that was under him.

SECT. 11.—3. The Bishops of some Mother-Churches, which were honoured by ancient Custom.

Besides these there were a third sort of primates, who, though they were neither bishops of titular metropoles, nor the oldest bishops of the province, yet took place of all the rest, by a general deference that was paid to them, out of regard to the eminency of their see, being some Mother-

[1] Con. Chalced. Act. 6. t. iv. p. 612.
[2] Con. 6. Gen. Act. 18.
[3] Con. Chalced. Act. xiii. p. 716.
[4] Con. 6. Gen. Act. xviii. p. 1060.

Church, or particularly honoured by ancient prescription. This was the case of the bishop of Jerusalem. That city was no metropolis of the empire, but subject to Cæsarea, the metropolis of Palæstine; yet in regard that it was the Mother-Church of the world, this peculiar honour was paid to it,—that the bishop thereof was always next in dignity to the metropolitan of Cæsarea, and took place of all the other bishops of the province. And this privilege was confirmed to him by the Nicene council,[1] which made a canon to this purpose: "That, whereas by ancient custom and tradition, the bishop of Ælia had a particular honour paid him, the same should be continued to him, still reserving to the metropolis the dignity and privilege which belonged to it." Some fondly imagine[2] that this canon gave the bishop of Jerusalem patriarchal power, whereas it does not so much as make him a metropolitan, but leaves him subject to the metropolis of Palæstine, which was Cæsarea, as St. Jerom[3] informs us; whose words clear the sense of this canon, and prove that the bishop of Jerusalem was no metropolitan, as Valesius[4] imagines, but had only the second place of honour assigned him next to his metropolitan, which was that honorary primacy which the bishops of Jerusalem had always enjoyed; because, as the council of Constantinople words it,[5] "Jerusalem was the mother of all other Churches."

Sect. 12.—The Offices of Metropolitans. 1. To ordain their Suffragan Bishops.

But leaving these honorary primates, who had little more than a name, I am here to show what were the offices and privileges of those who were properly metropolitans; and they were these that follow. First, they were to regulate the elections of all their provincial bishops, and either ordain, or authorize the ordination of them. No bishop was to be elected or ordained without their consent and appro-

---

[1] Con. Nic. can. 7. Ἐχέτω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς, τῇ Μητροπόλει σωζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἀξιώματος. [2] Sylvius Addit. ad Caranz. Summ. Concil. [3] Jerom. Ep. 61, ad Pammach. Hoc ibi decernitur ut Palæstinæ Metropolis Cæsarea sit. [4] Vales. Not. in Euseb. v. 23. [5] Con. Constant. Ep. Synod. ad Damas.

on: otherwise the canons pronounce both the election the ordination null. "The Κῦρος, or *ratification* of all is done," says the council of Nice,[1] "belongs to the metro-tan in every province." And again, if any bishop is made out the consent of the metropolitan, this great synod[2] pro-nces such a one to be no bishop. The same rule is repeated e councils of Antioch,[3] Laodicea,[4] Arles,[5] Turin,[6] Sardica,[7] esus,[8] and Chalcedon.[9] And whereas some pretend that African primates had not this power, the contrary appears ently from several canons of their councils. The second ncil of Carthage[10] says, "No one shall presume to ordain shop without consulting the primate of the province, and ng his precept, though many other bishops should join with ." The third council of Carthage requires but three ops to the ordination of a bishop, but then,[11] "they must uch as are expressly authorized by the metropolitan." l the fourth council[12] requires either his presence, or east his authority and commission. Here a primate and etropolitan are the same thing, *viz.* the senior bishop he province, who usually went to the Church, where new bishop was to be placed, and consecrated him with own hands, as St. Austin and Possidius[13] testify, who good witnesses of their practice.

T. 13.—This Power continued to them after the setting up of Patriarchs.

Nor was this power at all infringed by setting up of iarchs above them. For though the metropolitans e then to be ordained by the patriarchs, and obliged to nd on them for it, who before were ordained by their provincial synod; yet still the right of ordaining their

---

on. Nic. can. 4. [2] Ibid. can. 6. [3] Con. Antioch. can. 19. n. Laodic. can. 12. [5] Con. Arelat. ii. can. 5 et 6. [6] Con. in. can. 1. [7] Con. Sardic. can. 6. [8] Con. Ephes. De-de Episc. Cypr. [9] Con. Chalced. Act. 13. It. can. 25. n. Carth. ii. c. 12. Inconsulto Primate cujuslibet Provinciæ nemo præ-t, licèt cum multis Episcopis, sine ejus præcepto Episcopum ordinare. n. Carth. iii. c. 39. Non minus quàm tres sufficiant, qui fuerint à Metro-ano directi ad ordinandum Episcopum. [12] Con. Carth. iv. c. 1, entu totius Provinciæ Episcoporum, maximèque Metropolitani vel præ-t, vel auctoritate ordinetur Episcopus. [13] Aug. Ep. 261. Possid. Aug. c. 8.

own suffragans, was all along preserved to them, and expressly confirmed by the council of Chalcedon;[1] nor do we ever find any patriarch assuming this power, except the bishop of Alexandria, for a particular reason; of which I shall give an account in the following chapter, sect. 11.

SECT. 14.—Yet this Power not arbitrary, but determined by the Major Vote of a Provincial Synod.

But here I must observe, that this power of metropolitans was not arbitrary. For though no bishop was to be elected or ordained without their consent, yet they had no negative voice in the matter, but were to be determined and concluded by the major part of a provincial synod. For so the council of Arles[2] decreed, "That if there arose any doubt or hesitation betwixt the parties, the metropolitan should side with the greater number." And the council of Nice[3] to the same purpose: "If two or three, out of a contentious humour, shall oppose the common election, duly and regularly made, according to the canons of the Church, in this case let the majority of voices prevail."

SECT. 15.—Metropolitans to be chosen and ordained by their own Provincial Synod.

And the same rule was to be observed in the ordination of metropolitans themselves, who were to be chosen and consecrated by their own provincial bishops; who were not obliged to send for a metropolitan out of another province to do it, but they had power to do it in their own provincial synod among themselves. This, St. Austin says, was the custom of the Catholic Church, both in Afric and Rome. And, therefore, when the Donatists objected against Cæcilian, primate of Carthage, "That his ordination was uncanonical, because he had not sent for the neighbouring primate of Numidia to come and ordain him," his answer was,[4] "That Cæcilian had no

[1] Con. Chalced. Act. 16. in fin. [2] Con. Arelat. 2. can. 5. Si inter partes aliqua nata fuerit dubitatio, majori numero Metropolitanus in electione consentiat. [3] Con. Nic. can. 6. [4] Aug. Brevic. Collat. tert. die. c. 16. Non exspectavit Cæcilianus ut Princeps à Principe ordinaretur; cùm aliud habeat Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Consuetudo, ut non Numidiæ, sed pro-

eed of this, since the custom of the Catholic Church was otherwise; which was, not to have the Numidian bishops to ordain the bishop of Carthage, but the neighbouring bishops of the province of Carthage: as it was not he custom at Rome, to send for a metropolitan out of another province, to ordain the bishop of Rome, but he was always ordained by the bishop of Ostia, a neighbouring bishop of the same province."

It is true there is a canon in the council of Sardica,[1] which orders *the bishops of the next province*, as some interpret it, to be called in to the ordination of a metropolitan, ἐς ἀπὸ τῆς πλησιοχώρου ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπους. But this, perhaps, may as well be rendered, *the neighbouring bishops*[2] *of the same province;*" and since custom, and the practice of the Church, which is the best interpreter of doubtful canons, does manifestly favour this sense, there is some reason so to understand it. But, however it be, here is no mention of one metropolitan having a right to ordain another. From which it appears, that in these times no metropolitan was obliged to go or send out of his own province, much less to Rome, for his ordination; but all was to be done by his suffragans in his own Church. Nor was any bishop obliged to go for ordination to his metropolitan's Church; but ordinarily the metropolitan, and the rest of the bishops, met synodically in the vacant Church, and there elected and consecrated a new bishop, in the presence of the people, for whom they ordained him. This was the first part of the metropolitan's office.

SECT. 16.—2. The second Office of Metropolitans, to decide Controversies arising among their Provincial Bishops, and take Appeals from them.

Their next office was to preside over their provincial bishops, and if any controversies arose among them, to interpose their authority to end and decide them; as also to

---

inquiores Episcopi Episcopum Ecclesiæ Carthaginis ordinent: sicut nec Romanæ Ecclesiæ ordinat aliquis Episcopus Metropolitanus, sed de proximo vestiensis Episcopus.

[1] Con. Sard. can. 6. [2] Harmenopulus so understood it; for in his Epitome he thus words it: Οἱ πλησιόχωροι τῆς ἐπαρχίας παρέστωσαν. Vid. Harmen. Epit. Canon. ap. Leunclav. Jur. Gr. Rom. t. i. p. 2.

hear the accusations of others, who complained of injury done them by their own bishops, from whom there was liberty always to appeal to their metropolitan. Thus in Afric it was ordained, by the council of Milevis,[1] "That if two bishops disputed about the bounds of their dioceses, the metropolitan should appoint a committee of bishops to hear and determine their controversy." If a presbyter or deacon was excommunicated by his own bishop, the council of Sardica[2] allows him liberty to appeal to the metropolitan of his province; or, if he were absent, to the metropolitan of the next province, to desire a new hearing of his cause. In such cases as these, the metropolitan had three ways of proceeding: either, first, he was to appoint a select number of bishops to be judges, which was the practice of Afric, where such judges were, therefore, called *Judices Electi*,[3] and their number assigned to be twelve,[4] if a bishop's cause was to be tried before them. Or, secondly, he was to refer the matter to a provincial synod, which seems to have been the general practice, when those called the Apostolical Canons were made; one of which orders,[5] "That when a bishop is accused, he shall be convened before a synod of bishops." Another says,[6] "The primate shall do nothing without the consent of all the other bishops; so concord will be preserved, and God will be glorified." And another, "Twice a year let there be a synod of bishops,[7] to examine doctrines of religion, and terminate all ecclesiastical controversies that may happen." But, thirdly, by Justinian's law,[8] the metropolitan has power to hear causes upon appeal himself, without a synod. Yet, whether he could proceed so far as to depose a bishop by his sole authority, is questioned. Spalatensis[9] gives some instances of bishops that were deposed by their metropolitans; but, for aught that appears, it was done in

[1] Con. Milev. can. 21. Per Episcopos judices causa finiatur, sive quos eis Primates dederint, sive quos ipsi vicinos ex consultu Primatis delegerint. [2] Con. Sard. can. 14. [3] Con. Carth. 3. can. 7. [4] Con. Carth. 1. can. 11. Episcopus à duodecim Consacerdotibus audiatur. [5] Can. Apost. c. 74. Con. Constant. 2 Gen. can. 6. [6] Ibid. c. 35. Con. Antioch. can. 9. [7] Ibid. c. 38. [8] Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. v. c. 29. [9] Spalat. de Repub. Eccl. par. 1. lib. 3. c. 7. n. 19.

synod. But whether it was, or was not, matters not much; for still, in all cases, by the same law of Justinian,[1] and the canons, there lay an appeal from the metropolitan to a provincial synod, of which he was only the president, or moderator and director of business in it.

SECT. 17.—3. Their third Office, to call Provincial Synods, which all Suffragans were obliged to attend.

And this leads us to a third office of the metropolitans, which was to call provincial synods, and preside in them. For since the canons[2] appointed two synods to be held ordinarily every year, in each province, besides such as might be called upon extraordinary occasions, it was necessary some one should be appointed to give notice of the time and place, and have authority both to convocate and preside in them. All things therefore relating to this matter were, by common consent, put into the primate's power, whose circular letters (which sometimes are called *synodicæ* and *tractoriæ*,[3] as the emperor's were called *sacræ*) were a legal summons, which no bishop of the province might disobey, under pain of suspension, or some such canonical censure, which is left to the discretion[4] of the metropolitan and the council.

SECT. 18.—4. Metropolitans to publish Imperial Laws and Canons, visit Dioceses, and correct Abuses.

It belonged to metropolitans to publish and disperse such imperial laws and canons as were, either by councils or emperors, made for the common good of the Church. This they are required to do by several laws[5] both of the Church and State, the better to diffuse the knowledge, and enforce the practice of them. Nor were they only to disperse the canons that were made, but to see that they were observed; which gave them right to visit and inquire into neglects, abuses, and disorders, committed by any bishop

---

[1] Cod. Just. ibid. [2] Con. Nic. can. 5. Antioch. c. 20. Agathen. c. 35. Arelat. 2. c. 18. Can. Apost. c. 38. [3] Aug. Ep. 317. ad Victorin. Tractoria ad me quinto Idus Novembris venit, &c. [4] Con. Chalced. can. 19. Con. Carth. 4. can. 21. Theodoret. Ep. 81. [5] Justin. Novel. 6. et 42.

throughout the whole province. The metropolitan, in this respect, is said to have the care of the whole province, by the council of Antioch.[1] Not that this gave him power to officiate in any other bishop's Church, or perform such acts as the bishop himself might perform alone;—such as the ordaining of presbyters and deacons, and the like; which are specialties of every bishop, reserved to them by the same council;—but, in case of omission, or scandalous neglect, the bishop of the metropolis was to manifest his care, with the advice of the rest of his brethren.

SECT. 19.—5. Bishops not to travel without the Letters of their Metropolitan.

In Afric all bishops paid a peculiar deference to the primate, in taking his license to travel, whenever they were called into a foreign country upon extraordinary occasions. This was expressly provided by a canon of the third council of Carthage:[2] "That no bishop should go beyond sea without consulting his primate, and taking his *Formatæ*, or *Letters of commendation*." Nor was this so peculiar to Afric, but that we may meet with the same rule and practice in other places, even as low as the time of Gregory the Great; who, in one of his Epistles,[3] gives the same direction to some bishops, in reference to their metropolitan, "That they should not travel upon urgent occasion, without his letters of concession."

SECT. 20.—6. Metropolitans to take care of vacant Sees within their Province.

It belonged to metropolitans to take care of all vacant sees within their province; to administer the affairs of the Church, during the vacancy; to secure the revenues of the bishopric; and procure a speedy election of a new bishop. In Afric the primate commonly appointed one of the neighbouring bishops to be his vicegerent in such a case, whom, therefore, the Canons (as has been observed before) call

---

[1] Con. Antioch, can. 9. Τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας.
[2] Con. Carth. 3. can. 28. Ut Episcopi trans mare non proficiscantur, nisi consulto Primæ Sedis Episcopo, &c. [3] Greg. M. Ep. 8. lib. vii.

an interventor.[1] The council of Riez,[2] in France, in like manner, puts the administration of a vacant see into the hands of a neighbouring bishop, under the inspection of the metropolitan. And the council of Valencia,[3] in Spain, authorises the metropolitan to punish purloiners of the revenues in the vacancy, and to send an administrator, till a new bishop is chosen. By a canon of the council of Chalcedon,[4] the care of the revenues of the Church is committed to the steward of the Church, the *Œconomus;* but the care of supplying the vacant see with a new bishop, within three months, is the business of the metropolitan.

SECT. 21.—7. Metropolitans to calculate the Time of Easter.

It belonged to the metropolitan yearly to review the calculation of the time of Easter, and give notice to his suffragans of it. The care of composing the cycle indeed was by the Nicene fathers particularly committed[5] to the bishop of Alexandria, as Pope Leo and others inform us; and he was to give notice to other Churches. But due care was not always taken in this matter, and therefore the metropolitan in every province was concerned to settle the time, and acquaint the whole province with it. As we find St. Ambrose[6] did for the province of Milan; and the bishop of Carthage[7] for the province of Afric: and the Spanish councils[8] order their metropolitans first to concert the matter among themselves, and then communicate it to their comprovincials.

SECT. 22.—How the Power of Metropolitans grew in after Ages.

Some later Canons[9] make it the privilege of metropolitans to consecrate all churches throughout the province. But I have showed before that this was originally the privilege of every bishop in his own diocese; and being a private act, which only concerned his own Church, and not the whole province, the metropolitan was to have no hand in it, no

---

[1] Con. Carth. 5. can. 8. [2] Con. Reiens. can. 5 et 6. [3] Con. Valent. can. 2. [4] Con. Chalced. c. 25. [5] Leo Ep. 62. al. 70. ad Marcian. Imper. [6] Ambros. Ep. 83. ad Episc. per Æmyliam. [7] Con. Carth. 3. can. 1. et 41. [8] Con. Bracar. 2. can. 9. Con. Tolet. 4. can. 4. [9] Gelas. Ep. i. c. 4. Montan. Tolet. Ep. ad Palentinos ap. Blondel. Apol. p. 150.

more than in the consecration of presbyters and deacons, by the ninth canon of the council of Antioch. Other Canons[1] bind the whole province to follow the forms and rites of divine service used in the metropolitan Church: but I have observed before, that anciently, every bishop had liberty to prescribe for his own diocese, and was under no limitation as to this matter, unless it were the order of a provincial council.

SECT. 23.—The Primate of Alexandria had the greatest Power of any other.

By this we see that the power of metropolitans in some places exceeded others. And I must here observe that the primate of Alexandria was the greatest metropolitan in the world, both for the absoluteness of his power, and the extent of his jurisdiction. For he was not metropolitan of a single province, but of all the provinces of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, in which there were at least six large provinces, out of which sometimes above an hundred bishops were called to a provincial council. Alexander summoned near that number to the condemnation of Arius,[2] before the council of Nice. And Athanasius[3] speaks of the same number meeting at other times; particularly the council of Alexandria, Anno 339, which heard and justified the cause of Athanasius, after his return from his banishment, had almost an hundred bishops in it; which was above thirty more than the bishop of Rome's *Libra*, which was but sixty-nine. Nor was the primate of Alexandria's power less than the extent of his jurisdiction; for he not only ordained all his suffragan bishops, but had liberty to ordain presbyters and deacons in all Churches throughout the whole district. Mr. Basnage[4] and Launoy, will have it, that he had the sole power of ordaining, and that not so much as a presbyter or deacon could be ordained without him. Valesius[5] thinks his privilege was rather that he might ordain if he pleased, but not that

---

[1] Concil. Gerundens. can. 1. Con. Epaun. can. 27. Con. Tolet. 11. can. 3.
[2] Alexand. Ep. Encycl. ap. Socrat. lib. i. c. 6.
[3] Athan. Apol. 2. p. 720. Con. Alexandr. Ep. Encycl. Con. tom. ii. p. 533.
[4] Basnag. Exerc. in Baron. p. 307. et Launoy, Ibid.
[5] Vales. observ. in Socrat. lib. iii.

he had the sole power of ordaining presbyters and deacons. But either way it was a great privilege, and peculiar to the bishop of Alexandria; for no other metropolitan pretended to the like power besides himself.

SECT. 24.—All Metropolitans called *Apostolici*, and their Sees, *Sedes Apostolicæ*.

I have but one thing more to observe concerning metropolitans; which is, that they were anciently all dignified with the name *Apostolici;* which was then no peculiar title of the bishop of Rome. For pope Siricius himself gives all primates[1] this appellation; and it continued to be their title to the days of Alcuin, who, speaking of the election of bishops, says[2] "when the clergy and people have chosen one, they draw up an instrument, and go with their elect to the *Apostolicus;*" by whom he means not the pope, but the primate or metropolitan of every province, who had the right and power of consecration.

CHAP. XVII.

Of Patriarchs.

SECT. 1.—Patriarchs, anciently called Archbishops.

NEXT in order to the metropolitans or primates, were the patriarchs; or, as they were at first called, archbishops and exarchs of the diocese. For, though now an archbishop and a metropolitan be generally taken for the same, to wit, the primate of a single province; yet anciently the name, archbishop, was a more extensive title, and scarce given to any but those whose jurisdiction extended over a whole imperial diocese; as the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, &c. That this was so, appears evidently from one of Justinian's Novels, where erecting the bishopric of *Justiniana Prima*

---

[1] Siric. Ep. 4. c. 1. Ut extra conscientiam Sedis Apostolicæ, id est, Primatis, nemo audeat ordinare. [2] Alcuin. de Div. Offic. c. 36. Cùm Episcopus Civitatis fuerit defunctus, eligitur alius à Clero seu Populo, fitque Decretum ab illis, et veniunt ad Apostolicum cum suo Electo.

into a patriarchal see, he says, "Our pleasure is, that the bishop of Justiniana shall not only be a metropolitan,[1] but an archbishop." Here the names are clearly distinguished, and an archbishop reckoned superior to a metropolitan. And hence it was, that after the setting up of patriarchal power, the name archbishop was appropriated to the patriarchs. Liberatus[2] gives all the patriarchs this title of archbishops. So does the council of Chalcedon frequently, speaking of the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople,[3] under the name of archbishops also.

Sect. 2.—And Exarchs of the Diocese.

These were otherwise called Ἔξαρχοι τῆς διοικήσεως, *exarchs of the diocese*, to distinguish them from the Ἔξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας, *the exarchs of a single province*, which were only metropolitans. Thus Domnus, bishop of Antioch, is styled, Exarch of the eastern[4] diocese, by the councils of Antioch and Chalcedon. And in the subscriptions of the sixth general-council at Constantinople, Theodore, bishop of Ephesus, subscribes himself both metropolitan of Ephesus,[5] and exarch of the Asiatic diocese; as also, Philalethes, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, styles himself exarch of the Pontic diocese. Which shows, that as the exarch of a province is a metropolitan, so the exarch of a diocese, is a patriarch in the ancient language of the Church. And by this we understand the meaning of the ninth and seventeenth canons of the council of Chalcedon, which allow of appeals from the metropolitan, to the exarch of the diocese.

Sect. 3.—Salmasius's Mistake about the first Use of the Name Patriarch.

As to the name patriarch, there is some dispute among learned men, when first it began to be used as an appropriate title of any Christian bishops. Salmasius,[6] and some others are of opinion, that the bishop of Alexandria had this title

---

[1] Justin. Novel. 11. Volumus, ut non solùm Metropolitanus, sed etiam Archiepiscopus fiat. [2] Liberat. Breviar. c. 17. [3] Con. Chalced. Act. 16. It. Act. 4. et Can. 30. [4] Con. Antioch. in Act. 14. Con. Chalced. [5] Con. 6. Gen. Act. 18. Con. tom. vi. p. 1077, et 1080. [6] Salmas. de Primat. c. iv. p. 44. It. not. in Vopiscum.

ıe of the emperor Hadrian, which was in the be-
the second century. Their reason is, because
r, in an epistle mentioned by Vopiscus, speaks of
at Alexandria. But the patriarch there spoken
any Christian, but a Jewish patriarch; as may
ı Hadrian's words, and the character which he
im. For he says, "He was one who was com-
orship both Christ and Serapis;" which agrees
the character of a Jewish patriarch, who neither
ed the heathen, nor the Christian religion, and
eded as much compulsion to bring him to wor-
as Serapis: but it does not at all agree to the
a Christian bishop, who, however he might need
mpel him to worship Serapis, yet must be sup-
ıg of his own accord to worship Christ. Besides,
h, which the emperor speaks of, was one who
occasionally into Egypt out of another country;
ot be said of the bishop of Alexandria, who had
d continual residence there: but it suits exactly
ıd condition of the Jewish patriarch, who resided
in Palæstine, and came but accidentally, or at
n times, into Egypt. These, and the like reasons
's conclude against Salmasius, that whoever is
not any Christian patriarch that is here spoken
us[2] fancies it was the heathen *Pontifex*, or high-
ypt. But the same reasons will hold against
, as against the other; for the high priest of
l in Egypt, and needed no compulsion to worship
this patriarch did: so that it must be the Jewish
and no other, which Hadrian speaks of, as Mr.
and bishop Pearson, with some others have ob-

Epist. ap. Vopiscum Vit. Saturnin. Illi, qui Serapin colunt,
t; et devoti sunt Serapi, qui se Christi Episcopos dicunt.
chisynagogus Judæorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum
ı Mathematicus, non Aruspex, non Aliptes. Ille ipse Patriarcha,
m venerit, ab allis Serapidem adorare, ab allis cogitur Chris-
[2] Baron. Annal. tom. ii. an. 112. [3] Basnag. Exercit.
. Pearson. Vindic. Ignat. Par. 2. c. 11. p. 328. Suicer. Thesaur.
πατριάρχης. Cave Anc. Chur. Gov. p. 153.

SECT. 4.—Of the Jewish Patriarchs, their first Rise, Duration, and Extinction.

These Jewish patriarchs, from whom, as it is generally agreed, the Christian patriarchs borrowed their names, were a sort of governors among the Jews, set up upon the destruction of Jerusalem; one of which had his residence at Tiberias, and another at Babylon, who were the heads of the Jews, dispersed throughout the Roman and the Persian empire. Of these there is frequent mention made in the ancient writers of the Church, Origen,[1] Epiphanius,[2] Cyril of Jerusalem,[3] Theodoret,[4] and many others. They continued in great power and dignity till the latter end of the fourth century, about which time their order ceased. For Theodoret says expressly, that long before this time their government was wholly abolished; and one of the laws of the younger Theodosius, Anno 429, speaks[5] of them as then extinct.

SECT. 5.—Of the Patriarchs among the Montanists.

Much about the same time, the Montanists, or Cataphrygian heretics, had an order of men among them, which they called patriarchs, and and another which they called *cenones*, both which were superior to their bishops, and, as it should seem, distinct orders from them. For St. Jerom[6] charges it on them as a crime, that they thrust down the order of bishops, who were the Apostles' successors, and set up an order of patriarchs, and an order of *cenones* among them; which makes some learned men[7] think, that when St. Jerom wrote that against the Monanists, the name patriarch was not as yet adopted into the Church, though the power was under another name.

---

[1] Orig. Περὶ αρχῶν. lib. iv. c. 1. [2] Epiphan. Hær. 30. [3] Cyr. Catech. 12. n. 7. [4] Theodor. Dial. 1. [5] Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. Tit. 8. de Jud. lib. xxix. [6] Jerom. Ep. 54. ad Marcel. adv. Montan. tom. ii. p. 128. Apud nos Apostolorum locum Episcopi tenent: apud eos Episcopus tertius est. Habent enim Primos de Pepuzâ Phrygiæ Patriarchas: Secundos quos appellant Cenones: atque ita in tertium, id est, penè ultimum locum, Episcopi devolvuntur. [7] Basnag. Exercit. Histor. p. 285. Hinc colligi possit, priscis temporibus nondum Episcopis insignioribus affixum fuisse nomen Patriarchæ.

SECT. 6.—The Name Patriarch first used by Socrates, and in the Council of Chalcedon.

Indeed the first time we meet with the name patriarch given to any bishop, by any public authority of the Church, is in the council of Chalcedon; which mentions[1] the most holy patriarchs of every diocese, and particularly Leo, patriarch[2] of great Rome. Richerius, who has written accurately about the councils, can trace the name no higher.[3] Among private authors, the first that mentions patriarchs by name, is Socrates,[4] who wrote his history about the year 440, eleven years before the council of Chalcedon. By what he says, it appears, that during the interval between the general-council of Constantinople, Anno 381, and that of Chalcedon, the name patriarch began to be an appropriate title of some eminent bishops in the Church: for, speaking of the fathers at Constantinople, he says, "They constituted patriarchs, dividing the provinces among them." Valesius[5] and Dr. Cave[6] think Socrates speaks not of true and proper patriarchs, but only of extraordinary legates, or *pro tempore* commissioners, appointed by the council to judge who were fit to be received to catholic communion in the several dioceses that were allotted them. But all others understand him in the proper sense, because, by this time, patriarchal power was settled in all the dioceses of the Roman empire.

SECT. 7.—Four different Opinions concerning the first Rise of Patriarchal Power.

But though the name of patriarchs came not into the Church till about the time of Socrates, yet the power itself, as is agreed on all hands, was much earlier; though, where precisely to fix the epocha, and date its rise, is not so easy to determine. Some carry it as high as the Apostles, and derive it, as they do the pope's supremacy, from St. Peter.

---

[1] Con. Chalced. Act. ii. p. 338. Ὁσιώτατοι πατριάρχαι διοικήσεως ἑκάστης.
[2] Act. iii. p. 395. [3] Rich. Hist. Concil. tom. i. c. 2. n. 11. Nomen Patriarcharum primum, quod sciam, usurpatum in Synodo Chalcedonensi.
[4] Socrat. H. E. lib. v. c. 8. [5] Vales. Annot. in Socrat. [6] Anc. Ch. Gov. p. 147.

So Baronius,[1] who is followed by the most eminent writers of his own communion, de Marca, Valesius, Richerius, Pagius, and Schelstrate. Others justly reject this, as founded upon no good authority, nor evidenced by any genuine records of the ancient Church, but only the spurious epistles of the first popes; and reckon the first rise of patriarchs to have been after the apostolical age, and some time before the council of Nice. This is the opinion of Spalatensis,[2] and Mr. Brerewood. The third opinion is that of Balzamon,[3] and other modern Greeks, that patriarchs were first instituted by the council of Nice. And this seems to be favoured by St. Jerom; for in his epistle to Pammachius, writing against the errors of John of Jerusalem, he says, "It was decreed in the council of Nice,[4] that Cæsarea should be the metropolis of Palæstine, and Antioch the metropolis of the whole east; therefore, the bishop of Jerusalem must either appeal to the bishop of Cæsarea, as his immediate metropolitan, or to the bishop of Antioch, as metropolitan of the east." But if I rightly understand St. Jerom, he does not mean (as some mistake him) that patriarchs were first set up by the council of Nice; for then metropolitans must be so too, since he says the same of them, which yet every one knows were in the Church long before the council of Nice. His meaning, then, must be, that both metropolitans of provinces, and metropolitans of dioceses, were in being before the council of Nice, and only received confirmation, or a canonical establishment from it. And, indeed, it is evident, that, that the Nicene fathers made no alteration in these matters, but only confirmed the ancient rights of the bishops of principal cities, as they found them authorized by custom before. For the words[5] they use are, "Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, *let ancient custom still take place;*

[1] Baron. Annal. tom. i. an. 39. n. 16. Pet. de Marca de Concord. tom. i. lib. i. c. 3. n. 5. Vales. Observ. Eccles. lib. iii. Richer. Hist. Concil. tom. i. c. 1. n. 14. Ant. Pag. Critic. an. 37. n. 9. [2] Spalat. de Repub. Par. i. lib. iii. c. 12. n. 21. Brerewood of Patriar. Gov. Q. 1. [3] Balzam. in can. 6. Con. Nic. [4] Hieron. Ep. 61. tom. ii. p. 178. Ad Alexandrinum Episcopum Palæstina quid pertinet? Ni fallor, hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palæstinæ Metropolis Cæsarea sit, et totius Orientis Antiochia. Aut igitur ad Cæsariensem Episcopum referre debueras;——Aut si procul expetendum judicium erat, Antiochiam potiùs literæ dirigendæ. [5] Con. Nic. can. 6.

Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, the bishop of Alex-
hall have power over all; because such also is the
of the bishop of Rome. And, accordingly, in An-
id in other provinces, let the privileges be preserved
hurches."

it is plain, that no new power is given to any
but only what ancient custom and practice had
l them. So that either patriarchs were set up by
before the council of Nice,[1] and confirmed by the
as St. Jerom thinks, or else not introduced till af-
s. This last opinion (notwithstanding what St.
ays) is embraced by the famous Mr. Launoy,[2] Mr.
s,[3] Dr. Beverege,[4] and Dr. Cave,[5] who think that pa-
l power was not confirmed by the Nicene canon,
wn in the Church till about the time of the second
council of Constantinople, Anno 381.

ar. 8.—The Opinion of Spalatensis and St. Jerom preferred.

matter so obscure, and so variously controverted
learned men, it is not easy to determine where the
s. Patriarchal power was not set up at one and the
me in all places. Alexandria and Antioch were as
any, and the bishop of Alexandria, before the coun-
lice had all Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis under his
tion, as appears from the Nicene canons. This was
cesis Ægyptiaca, which consisted of six large pro-
four in Egypt, *viz.* Thebais, Arcadia, Augustanica,
gyptus properly so called, Libya Inferior, and Libya
r, which is Pentapolis. As all these were subject to
efectus Augustalis of Egypt, so they were likewise
the jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexandria. So
was not only a metropolitan of a single province,
six provinces joined in one diocese. But, now, the
n is, whether, at this time, he had any metropoli-
der him? For, if he had, then he was properly a pa-
at the time of the Nicene council. As to this, I can

1 Pin Bibliothec. vol. ii. p. 252. It. de Antiq. Eccl. Disciplin. Dis-
ct. 11. p. 35. 2 Launoy, de Rect. Interpr. can. 6. Con. Nic.
Exercit. Histor. p. 307. 4 Bevereg. Not. in can. 2. Con.
5 Cave Anc. Ch. Gov. c. 2 et 4.

only say, that Epiphanius and Synesius do expressly mention archbishops and metropolitans under the archbishop of Alexandria, in the time of Athanasius, and Alexander, his predecessor, who were both present in the council of Nice. But whether they mean metropolitans in the proper sense, or only coadjutors to the archbishop of Alexandria, I cannot yet determine. I will recite the passages, and leave the curious and the learned to make further inquiry. Synesius says, "The great Athanasius seeing the Church of Ptolemais had need of a bishop that was able to cherish and augment the small sparks of true religion, which was then in a dwindling condition there, and finding Siderius, bishop of Palæbisca, a man fit for great business, he commanded him to remove[1] thence to Ptolemais, to govern the metropolitical Church there." And Epiphanius,[2] speaking of Meletius, the author of the Meletian schism, before the council of Nice, says, expressly, "He was an archbishop in Egypt, under Alexander, archbishop of Alexandria, to whom he gave the first information against Arius." This agrees with what he says of him in another place,[3] "That he was chief of the Egyptian bishops, and next in order to Peter in the archbishopric, being his assistant, and administering ecclesiastical affairs under him. For there the custom is, for the archbishop of Alexandria to have the ordering of ecclesiastical matters throughout all Egypt, Thebais, Mareotes, Libya, Ammoniaca, Mareotis, and Pentapolis." So that as the bishop of Alexandria had six provinces under him, he seems also to have had subordinate metropolitans, or archbishops, under him likewise, as the archbishop of Lycopolis, in Thebais, the metropolitan of Ptolemais, in Pentapolis. And if these were properly metropolitans, he must be a patriarch, under the name of metropolitan of the whole Egytian diocese, as they

---

[1] Syncs. Ep. 67. ad Theoph. p. 231. Πάμμεγαν Ἀθανάσιον,---τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον, ὡς μείζεσι πράγμασιν ἐπιτήδειον, ἐκεῖ διαβῆναι κελεῦσαι, τὴν Μητροπολῖτιν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιτροπεύσοντα. [2] Epiphan. Hær. 69. n. 3. Ὁ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Μελήτιος ὁ κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον, ὑπὸ δὲ χεῖρα Ἀλεξάνδρου.
[3] Hær. 68. Meletian. n. 1. Ὁ Μελήτιος τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον προήκων, καὶ δευτερεύων τῷ Πέτρῳ κατὰ τὴν Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν, ὡς δὶ ἀντιλήψεως αὐτοῦ χάριν, &c. &c.

were metropolitans of their respective provinces; which is the thing that St. Jerom asserts in reference to Cæsarea and Antioch, "That the one was the metropolis of Palæstine, and the other the metropolis of the oriental diocese; and this, from ancient custom, ratified and confirmed by the council of Nice."

SECT. 9.—Patriarchal Power established in three General Councils successively: viz. Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.

But however this be, (for I determine nothing positively in this matter), the next age affords us very pregnant proofs of the establishment and growth of patriarchal power. The general-council of Constantinople,[1] Anno 381, has a canon to fix the limits of the several dioceses; so that the bishop of Alexandria should only administer the affairs of the Egyptian diocese; the bishops of the east, the eastern diocese, reserving the privileges granted by the council of Nice to the Church of Antioch; the bishops of the Asiatic diocese, the Asiatic Churches only; those of the Pontic diocese, the Pontic Churches; and those of the Thracian diocese, the Thracian Churches only.

Theodoret,[2] speaking of this council, says, "They divided the dioceses, and assigned every diocese its proper limits and jurisdiction." And Socrates,[3] more expressly, "That they constituted patriarchs, and distributed the provinces, so that no bishops should meddle with the affairs of another diocese, as was used to be done in times of persecution. Nectarius was allotted Constantinople and Thrace; Helladius, St. Basil's successor, the Pontic diocese, &c."

About fifty years after this, Anno 431, the third general-council was held at Ephesus, where we find the bishop of Antioch laying claim to the power of ordinations in the province of Cyprus: but this proving to be an unjust claim, the council made a decree in favour of the Cyprian bishops, exempting them from the jurisdiction of Antioch; because by ancient custom they always were exempt: and it is added,[4] "That the same rule should be observed in all dio-

[1] Con. C. Pol. Can. 2. [2] Theod. Ep. 86. ad Flav. tom. iii. p. 963. [3] Socrat. H. E. lib. v. c. 8. Πατριάρχας κατέστησαν, &c. [4] Con. Ephes. 1. Act. 7. Decret. de Episc. Cypr.

ceses and provinces, that no bishop should seize upon any province which did not anciently belong to his jurisdiction." This plainly implies, that the bishop of Antioch had then several provinces, or a whole diocese, under his power; which was confirmed to him by the council, and he was only denied jurisdiction over the province of Cyprus, because of ancient right it did not belong to him.

About eighteen years after this, Theodosius junior, and Valentinian, called the second council of Ephesus, Anno 449: and in the letter of summons to Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, they give him orders to bring ten metropolitans[1] of his diocese with him. This is noted by Liberatus, in his Breviary, and the letter is still extant[2] in the council of Chalcedon; by which it appears, that at this time the archbishop of Alexandria had a great number of metropolitans, within the Egyptian diocese, under his jurisdiction. So that though there be some dispute concerning the first rise and original of patriarchal power, yet there remains no manner of doubt but that it was come to its full height and establishment in the time of the general councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.

Sect. 10.—The Power of Patriarchs not exactly the same in all Churches. The Patriarch of Constantinople had some peculiar Privileges.

Therefore the next inquiry is into the rights and privileges of these patriarchs. And here it is to be nicely observed that the power of patriarchs was not one and the same precisely in all Churches, but differed according to the different customs of places and countries; or according as it was the pleasure of kings or councils to bestow greater privileges on them. The patriarch of Constantinople, when he was first advanced by the second general council, had only the single diocese of Thrace assigned him[3] for the exercise of his jurisdiction: but in the next age he was grown to be a sort of patriarch over the patriarchs of Ephesus and Cæsarea in the Asiatic and Pontic

[1] Liberat. Breviar. c. 12. Imperator dirigens Sacram Dioscoro in Alexandriam, præcepit, ut cum decem Metropolitanis Episcopis, quos voluisset, ipse eligeret, et veniret Ephesum. [2] Con. Chalced. Act. 1. C. tom. iv. p. 100.
[3] Con. Const. 1. Can. 2.

dioceses, by the voluntary consent of those two exarchs, (no doubt) at first, paying a deference to the exarch of the royal city; which, advancing into a custom, was afterwards confirmed by canon in the council of Chalcedon. In the sixteenth session of that council there is a long debate about this matter, the Pope's legates warmly stickling against it. But all the metropolitans of the two dioceses of Asia and Pontus then in council, together with Thalassius, bishop of Cæsarea, and exarch of the Pontic diocese, with one voice declaring, "that the bishop of Constantinople had, by long custom and prescription, enjoyed the privilege of ordaining metropolitans in those two dioceses, as well as that of Thrace," it was decreed that this privilege should be continued to him, notwithstanding the bishop of Rome's intercession against it.[1] Also by two canons of that council he is allowed to receive appeals[2] from the exarchs of those dioceses, because his throne was in the royal city: and in such parts of those dioceses as were chiefly in the hands of barbarians, he is authorized by another canon[3] to ordain all the bishops, which in other parts was the sole privilege of the metropolitans. Theodoret[4] observes even of Chrysostom himself, before the council of Chalcedon, that he exercised this power over all the three dioceses; for he says, "His care extended not only over Constantinople and Thrace, which consisted of six provinces, but over Asia and Pontus, each of which had eleven civil prætors in them." We are not therefore to take an estimate of patriarchal power from the growing greatness of Constantinople, but to distinguish the peculiar privileges of some patriarchs above others, which is the only way to understand the power of each.

SECT. II.—The Patriarch of Alexandria had also Privileges peculiar to himself.

For the patriarch of Alexandria had also some prerogatives, which no other patriarch besides himself enjoyed. Such was the right of consecrating and approving every single bishop throughout all the provinces of his diocese.

---

[1] Con. Chalced. can. 28 et Act. 16. per Tot. [2] Ibid. can. 9 et 17.
[3] Con. Chal. can. 28. [4] Theod. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 28.

This privilege was not allowed even to the patriarch of Constantinople; for the council of Chalceden, in the very same place where they give him power to consecrate the metropolitans of three whole dioceses, deny him the privilege of consecrating the suffragan bishops of those metropolitans; and reserve it as an ancient right of each metropolitan, with a synod of his provincial bishops, to consecrate all the bishops within his province, the archbishops of Constantinople neither being consulted, nor having[1] any hand in those ordinations. But it was otherwise at Alexandria. For the bishop of Alexandria, whilst he was only a metropolitan, had the ordination of all the bishops of the six provinces of the Egyptian diocese, being the sole and only metropolitan in all those provinces; and having but the same diocese when he came to be a patriarch, he continued his ancient custom of ordaining all the bishops throughout the six provinces, notwithstanding that new metropolitans were set up in them. And in this the patriarch of Alexandria differed from all others; for in all other dioceses the metropolitans had the right of ordaining their suffragan bishops, which here the patriarch retained to himself, as an ancient branch of his metropolitan power. I know, indeed, a very learned[2] person is of a different opinion: he says, "The bishop of Alexandria was rather a loser by being made a patriarch; for now according to the constitution of Church-policy, the ordination of suffragan bishops, which before belonged entirely to him, was devolved upon the several metropolitans under him." But this assertion proceeds upon a supposition, that patriarchal rights were exactly the same in all places; which, from the instance I have given of Constantinople, appears to be otherwise; for the patriarchs of Ephesus and Cæsarea had not the ordination of their own metropolitans, but they were all subject to the bishop of Constantinople. And as to the case of Alexandria, it appears from Synesius, who was himself metropolitan of Ptolemais, that the ordination not only of the

[1] Con. Chalced. Act. 16. in fin. Etiam nihil communicante in illorum Ordinationibus Archiepiscopo Regiæ Constantinopolis. [2] Dr. Cave Anc. Ch. Gov. c. iv. p. 159.

metropolitans, but of all the suffragan bishops throughout the whole district of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, belonged still to the patriarch of Alexandria. For, in a letter to Theophilus, acquainting him how he and two other bishops had met at Olbiæ to make choice of a bishop, and that one Antonius was unanimously chosen by the people; he adds,[1] "that yet there was one thing wanting, which was more necessary than all, viz. his sacred hand to consecrate him." Which shows, that the bishop of Alexandria still retained his ancient right of consecrating all the bishops of the Egyptian diocese.

SECT. 12.—The First Privilege of Patriarchs was to Ordain all the Metropolitans of the Diocese, and receive his own Ordination from a Diocesan Synod.

In other dioceses the patriarch's power was chiefly seen in the ordination or confirmation of all the metropolitans that were under him. This appears from the forecited canons[2] of the council of Chalcedon, and several of Justinian's Novels; one of which[3] takes notice of the bishop of Constantinople's ordaining all the metropolitans under him; and another gives the same power to the patriarch of Justiniana Prima,[4] then newly advanced to patriarchal dignity by Justinian, because it was the place of his nativity. And that this was a peculiar privilege of patriarchs, appears further from one of the Arabic canons published by Turrian, under the name of the Nicene canons, which were invented after the name of patriarchs was well known in the Church. The 36th of these canons, speaking of the Catholic of Ethiopia,[5] who was no patriarch, but subject to the patriarch of Alexandria, says, "He shall not have power to ordain archbishops, as patriarchs have; because he hath not the power or honour of a patriarch."

---

[1] Synes. Ep. 76. ad Theoph. Ἑνὸς ἔτι δεῖ, τὸ κυριωτάτου μέντοι, τῆς ἱερᾶς σου χειρός. [2] Con Chalc. cap. 28 et Act. 16. [3] Justin. Novel. 7. [4] Justin. Nov. 131. c. 3. Per tempus Beatissimum Justinianæ Primæ Patriæ nostræ Archiepiscopum habere semper sub suâ jurisdictione Episcopos Provinciarum Daciæ Mediterraneæ, et Daciæ Ripensis, et Privalis (al. Triballiæ) et Dardaniæ, et Mysiæ superioris, et Pannoniæ; et ab eo hos ordinari, ipsum verò à proprio ordinari Concilio. [5] Con. Nicen. Arab. c. 36. Non tamen jus habeat constituendi Archiepiscopos, ut habet Patriarcha; siquidem non habet Patriarchæ honorem et potestatem.

It was, therefore the prerogative of patriarchs (those of Ephesus and Cæsarea only excepted) to ordain the metropolitans under them; but they themselves were to be ordained by a diocesan synod, as Justinian's forecited Novel[1] informs us. And this was called the canonical ordination of a patriarch. For so the council of Constantinople, in their synodical epistle to the western bishops, prove the ordination of Flavian, bishop of Antioch, (who presided over all the eastern diocese,[2] as Theodoret says) to be canonical; because he was ordained not only by the bishops of the province, but "Τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως, *the bishops of the whole eastern diocese*[3] *synodically met together.*"

SECT. 13.—A Second Privilege, to call Diocesan Synods and preside in them.

2ndly. The next privilege of patriarchs was the power of convening their metropolitans and all the provincial bishops to a diocesan synod; which privilege was founded upon the same canons that granted metropolitans authority to summon provincial synods, and preside in them; for by just analogy the patriarch was to have the same power over the metropolitans, that they had over their provincial bishops. And, therefore, Theodoret,[4] speaking of his own attendance at the synods of his patriarch at Antioch, says, "He did it in obedience to the ecclesiastical canons, which make him a criminal that is summoned to a synod, and refuses to pay his attendance at it."

SECT. 14.—A Third Privilege, to receive Appeals from Metropolitans and Provincial Synods.

3dly. Another privilege of patriarchs was the power of receiving appeals from metropolitans and provincial synods, and reversing their decrees, if they were found faulty. "If any bishop or clergyman have a controversy with the metropolitan of his province, let him have recourse to the exarch of the diocese," says the council of Chalcedon[5] in one canon;

---

[1] Novel. 131. Ipsum verò (Patriarcham) à proprio ordinari Concilio.
[2] Theod. H. E. lib. v. c. 23.
[3] Con. Constant. Ep. ad Occident. ap. Theod. H. E. lib. v. c. 9.
[4] Theod. Ep. 81.
[5] Con. Chalced. can. 9.

and in another,"[1] If any man is injured by his own bishop, or metropolitan, let him bring his cause before the exarch of the diocese, or the throne of Constantinople." These canons are adopted into the civil law, and confirmed by imperial edicts. For, by one of Justinian's Constitutions,[2] the patriarch is to receive appeals from a provincial synod, and give a final determination to all causes that are regularly brought before him: and the regular way of proceeding is there specified; which is, "That no man shall bring his cause first before the patriarch, but first before his own bishop, then before the metropolitan, after that before a provincial synod, and last of all before the patriarch, from whose judgment there lay no appeal." The same is repeated and confirmed by other laws[3] of that emperor, which need not here be recited.

SECT. 15.—A Fourth Privilege, to censure Metropolitans, and also their Suffragans, when Metropolitans were remiss in censuring them.

4thly. As patriarchs might receive appeals from metropolitans, so they had power to inquire into their administration, and correct and censure them, in case of heresy, or misdemeanour, or any mal-administration, which made them liable by the canons to ecclesiastical censure. Justinian made an express law to this purpose,[4] "That if any clergyman was accused in point of faith, or morals, or transgression of the sacred canons; if he was a bishop, he should be examined before his metropolitan; but if he was a metropolitan, then, before the archbishop, that is, the patriarch to whom he was subject." By virtue of this power Chrysostom deposed Gerontius,[5] metropolitan of Nicomedia; and Atticus decided a controversy between Theodosius and Agapetus,[6] who contended about the throne of Synada, the metropolis of Phrygia Pacatiana: and it

---

[1] Ibid. can. 17. [2] Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 4. c. 2 [3] Just. Novel. 123. c. 22. Phot. Nomocan. tit. xix. c. 1. [4] Novel. 137. c. v. Quoties quidam Sacerdotum accusabuntur vel de Fide, aut turpi Vitâ, aut ob aliquid aliud contra sacros Canones admissum; si quidem Episcopus est is qui accusatus est, ejus Metropolitanus examinet ea quæ dicta sunt: Si verò Metropolitanus sit, ejus Beatissimus Archiepiscopus sub quo degit.
Sozom. H. E. lib. i. c. vi. [6] Socrat. H. E. lib. vii. c. iii.

were easy to add many other instances of the like nature out of the ancient councils, which concurred with the patriarchs in the exercise of this power. Nor did this power extend only over metropolitans, but over their suffragan bishops also. For though every provincial bishop was to be tried by his own metropolitan and a provincial synod; yet, in case they were negligent and remiss in executing the canons against delinquents, the patriarch had power to take the matter into his own cognizance, and ensure any bishop within the limits of his jurisdiction. Thus Sozomen[1] observes of Chrysostom, "that in one visitation at Ephesus he deposed thirteen bishops of Asia, Lycia, and Phrygia, for simony, and such other corrupt practices." This was done in a synod of seventy bishops, held at Ephesus, Anno 401, as Valesius[2] and Du Pin observe out of Palladius, who mentions the same thing, though he speaks but of six bishops then deposed.

SECT. 16.—A Fifth Privilege. Patriarchs might make Metropolitans their Commissioners, &c.

5th y The patriarch had power to delegate, or send a metropolitan into any part of his diocese, as his commissioner, to hear and determine, ecclesiastical causes in his name; at least it was so in the diocese of Egypt, where Synesius was bishop. For, in one of his epistles,[3] writing to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, he tells him what a difficult task he had put him upon, when he sent him through an enemy's country, to Hydrax and Palæbisca, two villages in the confines of Lybia, to determine a dispute that was risen there, about erecting those places into bishop's sees; "but," says he, "there lies a necessity upon me, νόμον ἡγεῖσθαι, *to take every thing for a law* that is injoined me by the throne of Alexandria."

SECT. 17.—A Sixth Privilege. The Patriarch to be consulted by his Metropolitans in Matters of any great Moment.

6thly. And as the metropolitans did every thing that was canonically injoined them by the patriarch, so they did

[1] Sozom. H. E. lib. viii. c. vi. [2] Vales. Not. in Loc. Du Pin Biblioth. vol. iii. Vit. Chrysost. [3] Synes. Ep. lxvii. p. 221.

nothing of any great moment without him; paying the same deference to him, that the canons obliged their suffragans to pay to them. This, at least, was the custom of Egypt, as appears from a noted passage related in the acts of the council of Chalcedon,[1] where we find, that when Pope Leo's epistle against Eutyches was subscribed by all the bishops in council, the Egyptian bishops then present refused to do it, because they had then no patriarch, and it was not lawful for them to do it without the consent of a patriarch by the rule of the council of Nice; which orders all the bishops of the Egyptian diocese, to follow the archbishop of Alexandria, and do nothing without him. This they pleaded in council, and their plea was accepted, and a decree passed in their favour upon it; "That since this was the custom of the Egyptian diocese, to do nothing of this nature without the consent and authority of their archbishop, they should not be compelled to subscribe, till a new archbishop was chosen."

SECT. 18.—A Seventh Privilege. Patriarchs to communicate to the Metropolitans such Imperial Laws as concerned the Church, &c.

7thly. It was the patriarch's office, to publish both ecclesiastical and civil laws, which concerned the Church, and to take care for the dispersion and publication of them, in all Churches of their diocese. The method is prescribed by Justinian in the epilogue to the sixth Novel; "The patriarchs of every diocese shall publish these our laws in their respective Churches, and notify them to the metropolitans under them. The metropolitans likewise shall publish them in their metropolitical Churches, and make them known to the bishops under them; that so they may publish them in their respective Churches, and no one be left ignorant in our whole empire of what we have enacted for the glory of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." See also Novel, 42, directed toMenas, patriarch of Constantinople, concluding in the same tenour.

---

[1] Con. Chalced. Act. iv. p. 512 et 513. [2] Con. Chalc. can. 30. ex Act. 4.

SECT. 19.—The Eighth Privilege. Great Criminals reserved to the Patriarch's Absolution.

8thly. Synesius observes another privilege in the diocese of Alexandria; which was, that in the exercise of discipline upon great criminals, and scandalous offenders, a peculiar deference was paid to the patriarch by reserving their absolution to his wisdom and discretion. As he gives an instance in one Lamponianus, a presbyter, whom he had excommunicated for abusing Jason, his fellow presbyter: "Though," says he,[1] "he expressed his repentance with tears, and the people interceded for him; yet I refused to absolve him, but remitted him over for that, to the sacred see; only assuming this to myself, that if the man should happen to be in manifest danger of death, any presbyter that was present should receive him into communion by my order. For no man shall go excommunicate out of the world by me. But in case he recovered he should still be liable to the former penalty, and expect the ratification of his pardon from your divine and courteous soul." But whether this respect was paid by all metropolitans to their patriarch in every diocese, I have not yet observed.

SECT. 20.—The Ninth Privilege. The greater Patriarchs Absolute, and Independent of one another.

9thly. The last privilege of patriarchs was, that they were originally all co-ordinate and independent of one another. I speak now of them as they were at their first institution; for after ages, and councils, and emperors, made great alteration in this matter. At first learned men[2] reckon there were about thirteen or fouteen patriarchs in the Church, that is, one in every capital city of each diocese of the Roman empire: the patriarch of Alexandria, over the Egyptian diocese; the patriarch of Antioch, over the eastern diocese; the patriarch of Ephesus, over the Asiatic diocese; the patriarch of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, over the Pontic diocese; Thessalonica, in Macedon, or Illyricum Orientale; Sirmium, in Illrycum Occidentale; Rome, in the Roman prefecture; Milan, in the Italic diocese; Carthage, in Afric; Lyons, in

[1] Synes. Ep. lxvii. p. 251. [2] Brerewood Patriarch. Gov. Q. I.

; Toledo, in Spain; and York, in the diocese of Britain. eatest part of these, if not all, were real patriarchs, lependent of one another, till Rome, by encroach- and Constantinople by law, got themselves made r to some of their neighbours, who became subordi- d subject unto them. The ancient liberties of the Churches, as also the African, and Italic diocese, eir long contests with Rome, before they could be t to yield obedience to her, are largely set forth by of our learned writers[1] in particular discourses on bject. I only here note that the eastern patriarchs, dria, Antioch, Ephesus, Cæsarea, and Constanti- were never subject to Rome, but maintained the liberty which the canons gave them. For though a and Ephesus, were made subordinate to the patri- Constanstinople, and any one might appeal from him; yet the appeal was to be carried no further, it were to a general-council.[2] Which shows the adency of the greater patriarchs one of another.

21.—The Patriarch of Constantinople dignified with the Title of Œcumenical, and his Church Head of all Churches.

patriarch of Constantinople had also the honourable œcumenical or universal patriarch given him; pro- in regard of the great extent of his jurisdiction. ustinian styles Menas, Epiphanius, and Anthemius, hops and œcumenical patriarchs, in several of his pts;[3] and Leo gives the same title to Stephen,—arch- and universal patriarch,—in ten laws,[4] one after r. So that it was no such new thing, as pope Gre- nade it, for the patriarch of Constantinople to be œcumenical bishop; for that title was given him by any years before, even from the time of Justinian: is a vulgar error in history to date the original of le from the time of Gregory I. which was in use at whole century before. But Justinian, in another Re-

---

rewood Patr. Gov. Q. 2 et 3. Cave Anc. Ch. Gov. c. v. [2] See orities cited before, § 14. [3] See Justin. Novel. 7. 16. 42. sp. Constit. Novel. 2. 3, &c.

script, goes a little further, and says[1] expressly, "that Constantinople was the head of all Churches;" which is as much as ever any council allowed to Rome, that is, a supremacy in its own diocese, and a precedency of honour in regard that it was the capital city of the empire. Equal privileges are granted to Constantinople, upon the same ground, because it was new Rome, and the royal seat, as the councils of Constantinople[2] and Chalcedon, with some others, word it. So that they had privileges of honour, and privileges of power; the first of which were peculiar to those sees; the other, in a great measure, common to them and all other patriarchal Churches, except those of Ephesus and Cæsarea, which, as I have often observed, were legally made subordinate to that of Constantinople.

SECT. 22.—Of subordinate Patriarchs. What Figure they made in the Church, and that they were not mere titular Patriarchs.

Some here may be desirous to know what authority those patriarchs had in the Church after their subordination to the other. There are who tell us that they were sunk down to the condition of metropolitans again, by the council of Chalcedon; but that is a mistake. For, 1st, they retained the name of exarchs of the diocese still, and so subscribed themselves in all councils. As in the sixth general-council, Theodore subscribes himself metropolitan of Ephesus, and exarch of the Asiatic diocese;[3] and Philalethes, metropolitan of Cæsarea, and exarch of the Pontic diocese.

2dly. They always sat and voted, in general-councils, next immediately after the five great patriarchs, Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who, by the canons,[4] had precedence of all the rest. Next to these, before all the metropolitans, the bishops of Ephesus and Cæsarea took place, as may be seen in the subscriptions of the fourth and sixth general-councils.[5]

3dly. They had power to receive appeals from metropo-

---

[1] Just. Cod. lib. i. tit. 3. c. 24. Constantinopolitana Ecclesia omnium aliarum est Caput. [2] Con. Const. can. 3. Con. Chalced. can. 28. Con. Trull. can. 36. Justin. Novel. 131. c. 2. [3] Con. 6. Gen. Act. xviii. [4] See Con. Trull. can. 36. et Justin. Novel. 131. c. 2. [5] Con. Chalced. Act. i. et iii. Con. 6. Gen. Act. 18.

litans, which is evident from the same canons of Chalcedon,[1] which give the patriarch of Constantinople power to take appeals from them. So that they were not mere titular patriarchs, as some in after-ages, but had the power as well as the name; the right of ordaining metropolitans, and receiving ultimate appeals, only excepted. But how long they or any others retained their power, is not my business here any further to inquire.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of the Ἀυτοκέφαλοι.

SECT. 1.—All Metropolitans anciently styled Ἀυτοκέφαλοι.

AMONG other titles which were anciently given to some certain bishops, we frequently meet with the name Ἀυτοκέφαλοι, *absolute and independent bishops;* which was not the name of any one sort of bishops, but given to several, upon different reasons. For, first, before the setting up of patriarchs, all metropolitans were Ἀυτοκέφαλοι, ordering the affairs of their own province with their provincial bishops, and being accountable to no superior but a synod; and that in case of heresy, or some great crime committed against religion and the rules of the Church.

SECT. 2.—Some Metropolitans independent after the setting up of Patriarchal Power, as those of Cyprus, Iberia, Armenia, and the Church of Britain.

And even after the advancement of patriarchs, several metropolitans continued thus independent, receiving their ordination from their own provincial synod, and not from any patriarch; terminating all controversies in their own synods, from which there was no appeal to any superior, except a general-council. Balsamon reckons among this sort of Ἀυτοκέφαλοι, the metropolitans of Bulgaria,[2] Cyprus, and Iberia. And his observation is certainly true of the two last, who were only metropolitans, yet independent of

[1] Con. Chalc. can. 9, et 17. [2] Balsam. in Con. Constant. 1. can. 2.

any patriarchal or superior power. For, though the bishop of Antioch laid claim to the ordination of the Cyprian bishops, in the council of Ephesus, yet the council, upon hearing the case, determined against him, making a decree,[1] "That, whereas, it never had been the custom for the bishop of Antioch to ordain bishops in Cyprus, the Cyprian bishops should retain their rights inviolable, and, according to canon and ancient custom, ordain bishops among themselves." And this was again repeated and confirmed by the council of Trullo,[2] even after the Cypriots were driven into another country by the incursions of the barbarians.

Others[3] observe the same privilege in the Iberian Churches, now commonly called Georgians; that they never were subject either to the patriarch of Constantinople, or any other; but all their bishops, being eighteen in number, profess absolute obedience to their own metropolitan, without any other higher dependance or relation.

And this was the case of the Armenian Churches in the time of Photius, as appears from an ancient Greek *Notitia Episcopatuum*, cited by Peter de Marca,[4] which says it was an Ἀυτοκέφαλος, and not subject to the throne of Constantinople, but honoured with independency in respect to St. Gregory of Armenia, their first Apostle.

And this was also the ancient liberty of the Britannic Church, before the coming of Austin, the monk, when the seven British bishops, which were all that were then remaining, paid obedience to the archbishop of Caer-Leon, and acknowledged no superior in spirituals above him. As Dinothus, the learned abbot of Bangor, told Austin,[5] in the name of all the Britannic Churches, "That they owed no other obedience to the pope of Rome, than they did to every godly Christian, to love every one in his degree in perfect charity: other obedience than this they knew none due to him whom *he* named pope, &c. But they were under the government of the bishop of Caer-Leon, upon Uske, who was their overseer under God."

---

[1] Con. Ephes. Act. vii. Decret. de Cypr. Epis. [2] Con. Trull. can. 39. [3] Brerewood Inquir. c. 17. Chytræus de Statu. Eccles. &c. [4] Marca de Primat. n. 27. p. 122. [5] Spelman. Con. Brit. an. 601. tom. i. p. 108.

SECT. 3.—A Third sort of Αὐτοκέφαλοι, such Bishops as were subject to no Metropolitan, but only to the Patriarch of the Diocese.

Besides all these there was yet a third sort of Αὐτοκέφαλοι, which were such bishops as were subject to no metropolitan, but immediately under the patriarch of the diocese, who was to them instead of a metropolitan. Thus for instance in the patriarchate or large diocese of Constantinople, the ancient Notitia, published by Leunclavius,[1] reckons thirty-nine such bishops throughout the several provinces; that published by Dr. Beverege[2] counts them forty-one; and the Notitia, in Carolus à Sancto Paulo[3] augments the number to forty-six. The bishop of Jerusalem is said[4] to have had twenty-five such bishoprics in his patriarchate, and the bishop of Antioch sixteen; as Nilus Doxopatrius, a writer of the eleventh century, in his book of the patriarchal sees, informs us. But what time this sort of independent bishoprics were first set up in the Church, is not certain; for the earliest account we have of them is in the Notitia of the emperor Leo Sapiens, written in the ninth century, where they are called archbishoprics, as in some other Notitiæ they are called metropolitical sees; though both these names were but titular, for they had no suffragan bishops under them.

SECT. 4.—A Fourth Sort of Αὐτοκέφαλοι.

Valesius mentions another sort of Αὐτοκέφαλοι, which were such bishops as were wholly independent of all others; as they had no suffragans under them, so neither did they acknowledge any superior above them, whether metropolitan, or patriarch, or any other whatsoever. Of this sort he reckons the bishops[5] of Jerusalem, before they were advanced to patriarchal dignity; but in this instance he plainly mistakes, and contradicts St. Jerom, who says expressly, "that the bishop of Jerusalem, was subject to the bishop of Cæsarea, as the metropolitan of all Palæstine, and to the

---

[1] Leunclav. Jus. Gr. Rom. tom. i. lib. ii. p. 88. [2] Bevereg. Pandect. tom. ii. Not. in Can. 26. Concil. Trull. [3] Car. à S. Paulo Append. ad Geogr. Sacr. p. 10. [4] Nilus Doxopatr. ap. le Moyne Varia Sacra. tom. i. [5] Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. v. c. 23. See chap. 17. sect. 7.

bishop of Antioch as metropolitan of the whole east," as has been noted in the last chapter. If there were any such bishops as he speaks of, they must be such as the bishop of Tomis in Scythia, who, as Sozomen[1] notes, was the only bishop of all the cities of that province; so that he could neither have any suffragans under him, nor metropolitan above him. But such instances are very rare, and we scarce meet with such another example in all the history of the Church. I have now completed the account of primitive bishops, and showed the distinctions which were among them in the external polity of the Church: I proceed in the next place therefore to consider the second order of the clergy, which is that of presbyters.

CHAP. XIX.

Of Presbyters.

Sect. 1.—The meaning of the Name Presbyter.

The name Πρεσβύτεροι, *presbyters* or *elders*, is a word borrowed from the Greek translation of the Old Testament, where it commonly signifies rulers and governors, being (as St. Jerom[2] notes) a name of office and dignity, and not a mere indication of men's age; for elders were chosen, not by their age, but by their merits and wisdom. So that as a senator among the Romans, and an alderman in our own language, signifies a person of such an order and station, without any regard to his age; in like manner a presbyter or elder in the Christian Church is one who is ordained to a certain office, and authorized by his quality, not by his age, to discharge the several duties of that office and station, wherein he is placed.

Sect. 2.—Apostles and Bishops sometimes called Presbyters.

And in this large extensive sense, it is readily granted by all, that bishops are sometimes called presbyters in the

[1] Sozom. lib. vi. c. 21. Lib. vii. c. 19. [2] Hieron. in Esai. 3. tom. v. p. 16. In Scripturis Sanctis Presbyteros merito et sapientiâ eligi, non ætate.

New Testament; for the Apostles themselves do not refuse the title. On the other hand, it is the opinion of many learned men, both ancient[1] and modern,[2] that presbyters were sometimes called bishops, whilst the bishops that were properly such were distinguished by other titles, as that of chief priests and Apostles, &c. of which I have given a particular account in one of the preceding chapters, and there evinced that they, who maintained this identity of names, did not thence infer an identity of offices, but always esteemed bishops and presbyters to be distinct orders.

SECT. 3.—The Original of Presbyters properly so called.

Here then taking presbyters in the strictest sense, for those only of the second order, we must first inquire into their original. The learned Dr. Hammond[3] advanced an opinion about this matter, which is something singular: he asserts, that in scripture times, the name of presbyters belonged principally, if not alone, to bishops; and that there is no evidence, that any of this second order were then instituted, though soon after, he thinks, before the writing of Ignatius's Epistles, there were such instituted in all Churches. The authorities he builds upon are Clemens Romanus and Epiphanius, who say, that in some Churches at first there were bishops and deacons, without any presbyters. But I conceive it will not hence follow, that it was so in all Churches; nor does Epiphanius maintain that, but the contrary, that as in some Churches[4] there were only bishops and deacons, so in others there were only presbyters and deacons: and that in large and populous Churches the Apostles settled both bishops, presbyters, and deacons; as at Ephesus, where Timothy was bishop, and had presbyters subject to him; which Epiphanius proves from Scripture. "That a bishop and presbyter," says he, "are not the

---

[1] Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Phil. 1. It. Hom. 11. in 1 Tim. iii. Theodoret. Com. in Phil. 1. 1. It. in Phil. 2. 25. et in 1 Tim. 3. 1. Ambrosiaster in Eph. 4. 11. Hieron. Com. in Tit. 2. Ep. 83. ad Ocean. et 85. ad Evagr. [2] Usser. Dissert. in Ignat. c. xviii. p. 232. It. Orig. of Bish. and Metro. p. 55. Cotelr. Not. in Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 1. [3] Ham. Annot. on Act. 11. 30. [4] Epiph. Her. 75, Aerian. n. 5.

same, the Apostle informs us, when writing to Timothy, who was a bishop, he bids him not rebuke an elder, but intreat him as a father. How comes the bishop to be concerned not to rebuke an elder, if he had no power over an elder? In like manner the Apostle says, 'against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses;' but he never said to any presbyter, receive not an accusation against a bishop; nor did he ever write to any presbyter, not to rebuke a bishop." This plainly implies, that in all such large and populous Churches as that of Ephesus, according to Epiphanius, all the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons were settled by the Apostles; though the smaller Churches were differently supplied at first; some only with presbyters and deacons, before bishops were constituted in them, and others only with bishops and deacons without any presbyters. For all Churches had not immediately all the same church-officers upon their first foundation, but time was required to complete their constitution, as bishop Pearson[1] has observed on this very passage of Epiphanius.

SECT. 4.—The Powers and Privileges of Presbyters.

Admitting, then, that presbyters, as well as bishops, were originally settled in the Church by the Apostles, we are next to inquire into the power and privileges that were proper to their order. And here I shall have occasion to say the less, having already showed[2] what offices they might perform by virtue of their ordinary power, only acting in dependance on, and subordination to their bishop, as the supreme minister of the Church. They might baptize, preach, consecrate, and administer the eucharist, &c., in the bishop's absence, or in his presence, if he authorized and deputed them, as has been noted before. They might also reconcile penitents, and grant them absolution in the bishop's absence: and some think they had power likewise to confirm in cases of necessity, by special license and de-

[1] Pearson. Vind. Ignat Par. 2. c. 13. p. 412. In aliquibus Ecclesiis ab origine fuisse Presbyteros, nondum constitutis Episcopis; in aliquibus Episcopos, nondum constitutis Presbyteris. [2] See before chap. 3.

legation. But these two things will be considered and discussed more particularly hereafter, when we come to treat of discipline and confirmation. What is further to be noted in this place, is the honour and respect that was paid to them, acting in conjunction with their bishop, who scarce did any thing in the administration and government of the Church, without the advice, consent, and amicable concurrence of his presbyters.

SECT. 5.—Presbyters allowed to sit with the Bishop on Thrones in the Church.

Hence it was that presbyters were allowed to sit together with the bishop in the Church (which privilege was never allowed to deacons:) and their seats were dignified with the name of thrones, as the bishop's was; only with this difference, that his was the high throne, and theirs the second thrones. In allusion to this, Gregory Nazianzen,[1] speaking of his own ordination to the degree of presbyter, says, "his father who ordained him, brought him by violence to the second thrones." And in his vision concerning the Church of Anastasia,[2] he thus represents the several orders of the Church: "Methought I saw myself (the bishop) sitting on the high throne, and the presbyters, that is, the guides of the Christian flock, sitting on both sides by me on lower thrones, and the deacons standing by them." By this we may understand what Constantine meant in his letter[3] to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse; when, giving him a summons to the council of Arles, he bids him also bring with him "two of the second throne," that is, two presbyters: and what Eusebius means by those words in his panegyric[4] upon the temple of Paulinus, where he says "he beautified and adorned the structure with thrones set up on high for the honour of the presidents or rulers;" by which it is plain he means the thrones of the presbyters, as well as the bishop; for they were both exalted above the seats of the common people. Nay, both the name and thing was then

---

[1] Naz. Carm. de Vitâ, *Κάμπτει βιαίως εἰς δευτέρους θρόνους.* [2] Id. Somn. de Ecclesiâ Anastasiæ. Orat. 20. de Laud. Basil. p. 340. *Δεύτερα τῆς καθέδρας.* [3] Ap. Euseb. lib. x. c. 5. *Δύο γε τινας τῶν ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου θρόνου.* [4] Euseb. lib. x. c. 4.

so usual, that Aerius drew it into an argument,[1] to prove the identity and parity of bishops and presbyters. "A bishop sits upon a throne, and so does a presbyter likewise;" which though it be but a very lame and foolish argument to prove what he intended, yet it is a plain intimation of what has here been noted, to have been the then known custom and practice of the Church. And little regard is to be had to those modern authors, who pretend to say that presbyters had not power to sit in the presence of their bishops; which is confuted by the acts and canons[2] almost of every council, and the writings of every ancient author, in which nothing more commonly occurs than the phrases, *Consessus Presbyterorum*, and *Sedere in Presbyterio*, importing the custom and privilege whereof we are now speaking.

SECT. 6.—The Form of their sitting in a Semicircle; whence they were called *Corona Presbyterii*.

There is one thing further to be noted concerning the manner of their sitting, which was on each hand of the bishop, in the form or figure of a semicircle; which is described by the author[3] of the Constitutions, under the name of Clemens Romanus, and Gregory Nazianzen, and others. Whence, as the bishop's throne is called the middle throne, or the middle seat by Theodoret[4] and the Constitutions: so for the same reason Ignatius[5] and the Constitutions[6] term the presbyters the spiritual crown or circle of the presbytery, and the crown of the Church; unless we will take this for a metaphorical expression, to denote only that presbyters united with their bishop, were the glory of the Church.

SECT. 7.—Presbyters the Ecclesiastical Senate, or Council of the Church, whom the Bishop consulted and advised with upon all Occasions.

This honour was done them in regard to their authority in the Church, wherein they were considered as a sort of

---

[1] Epiphan. Hær. 75. Aerian. [2] Con. Carthag. 4. c. 35, 36. Euseb. lib. 6. c. 20. Origen. Hom. 2. in Cantic. Con. Laodic. c. 55. Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57. Con. Ancyr. c. 18. [3] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57. Κείσθω δὲ μέσος ὁ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου θρόνος, &c. [4] Theod. Hist. lib. v. c. 3. Ὁ μέσος θῶκος. [5] Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 13. Πνευματικὸν στέφανον τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου [6] Constitut. lib. ii. c. 28. στέφανον ἐκκλησίας.

ecclesiastical senate, or council to the bishop, who scarce did any thing of great weight and moment, without asking their advice, and taking their consent, to give the greater force and authority to all public acts done in the name of the Church. Upon which account, St. Chrysostom[1] and Synesius[2] style them, "the court, or Sanhedrim of the presbyters;" and Cyprian,[3] "the sacred and venerable bench of the clergy;" St. Jerom[4] and others,[5] "the Church's senate, and the senate of Christ;" Origen[6] and the author of the[7] Constitutions, "the bishop's counsellors, and the council of the Church;" because, though the bishop was prince and head of this ecclesiastical senate, and nothing could regularly be done without him; yet neither did he ordinarily do any public act, relating to the government or discipline of the Church without their advice and assistance.

Sect. 8.—Some Evidences out of Ignatius and Cyprian, of the power and Prerogatives of Presbyters in conjunction with the Bishop.

The first ages afford the most pregnant proofs of this divine harmony between the bishop and his presbyters; for any one that ever looked into the writings of Cyprian, must acknowledge, that at Rome and Carthage, the two great Churches of the west, all things were thus transacted by joint consent: the bishop with his clergy did *communi consilio*[8] *ponderare, weigh things by common advice and deliberation.* Whether it was in the ordinations of the clergy, (for Cyprian would not so much as ordain a subdeacon or a reader without their consent,) or whether it was in the exercise of discipline and reconciliation of peni-

---

[1] Chrys. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. c. 15. Τὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων συνέδριον.
[2] Synes. Ep. 67, ad Theoph. [3] Cypr. Ep. 55 al. 59. ad Cornel. Cleri sacrum venerandumque Consessum. Con. Carth. iv. c. 35. Episcopus in Consessu Presbyterorum sublimior sedeat, &c. [4] Hieron. in Esai. iii. tom. v. p. 17. Et nos habemus in Ecclesiâ senatum nostrum, Cœtum Presbyterorum. [5] Pius Ep. 2. ad. Just. Vien. Salutat te senatus pauper Christi, apud Romam constitutus. [6] Orig. Com. in Mat. Βουλὴ ἐκκλησίας. Pearson. Vind. Ignat. Par. l. c. xi. p. 321. Hi autem βουλευταὶ Christiani sanè fuerunt Presbyteri. [7] Const. Apost. lib. ii. c. 28. Σύμβουλοι τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, συνέδριον καὶ βουλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. [8] Cypr. Ep. 33. al. 38. ad Cler. In Ordinationibus clericis solemus vos ante consulere, et mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare.

tents, Cyprian declares[1] his resolution to do all by common consent. And so Cornelius at the same time acted at Rome; for when Maximus and the rest of the Confessors, who had sided with Novatian, came afterward and made confession of their error, and desired to be admitted again into the communion of the Church, Cornelius would do nothing in it, till he had first called a presbytery, and taken both their advice and consent[2] in the affair, that he might proceed according to their unanimous resolution. Cyprian in several other of his Epistles,[3] speaks of the same deference paid to his presbytery, and in one place he more particularly tells them, "that it was a law and a rule[4] that he had laid down to himself, from the first entrance on his bishopric, that he would do nothing without their advice, and the consent of the people." Epiphanius observes the same practice at Ephesus, in the condemnation of Noetus; for first, he says, "He was convened before the presbytery,[5] and then again, upon a relapse, by them expelled the Church;" which at least must mean, that the bishop and his presbyters joined together in this ecclesiastical censure. In like manner, speaking of the first condemnation of Arius, he says, "Alexander, bishop of Alexandria,[6] called a presbytery against him, before whom, and some bishops then present, he examined him, and expelled him." Cotelerius, in his Notes upon the Constitutions, has published from an ancient Manuscript, one of the forms of Arius's deposition,[7] which

---

[1] Id. Ep. 6. al. 14. ad Cler. Ut ea, quæ circa Ecclesiæ gubernaculum utilitas communis exposcit, tractare simul, et plurimorum consilio examinata limare possemus. [2] Cornel. Ep. 46. al. 49. ad Cypr. p. 92. Omni actu ad me perlato, placuit contrahi Presbyterium—ut firmato consilio, quid circa personam eorum observari deberet, consensu omnium statueretur.

[3] Cypr. Ep. 24. al. 29. ad Cler. Ep. 32. ad Cler. [4] Cypr. Ep 6. al. 14. Quando à primordio Episcopatûs mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro, et sine consensu Plebis, meâ privatâ sententiâ gerere; Sed cum ad vos per Dei gratiam venero—in commune tractabimus. [5] Epiph. Hær. 57. n. i. Ἐπὶ πρεσβυτερίῳ ἀγόμενος. Ibid. Οἱ ἀυτοὶ πρεσβύτεροι ἐξέωσαν ἀυτὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. [6] Epiph. Hær. 69. Arian. n. iii. Συγκαλεῖται τὸ πρεσβυτέριον, καὶ ἄλλους τινὰς ἐπισκόπους παρόντας, &c. [7] Depositio Ari. ap. Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 28. Ἵνα ἐξ τὰ νῦν γραφόμενα γνῶτε, τὴν τε ἐν τέτοις συμφωνίαν ἑαυτῶν ἐπιδείξησθε, ἐξ τῇ καθαιρέσει τῶν περὶ Ἄρειον σύμψηφοι γενησθε.

may give some light to this matter; for thereby it appears that when Alexander sent forth his circular letters to all other bishops against Arius, he first summoned all the presbyters and deacons of Alexandria, and region of Mareotes, not only to hear what he had written, but also to testify their consent to it, and declare that they agreed with him in the condemnation of Arius. From whence we learn, that though the deposition was properly the bishop's act, yet to have it done with the greater solemnity, the consent both of the presbyters and deacons was required to it. And thus it was also in the condemnation of Origen: the council of Alexandria, which expelled him the city, was composed both of bishops and presbyters, who decreed, "that he should remove from Alexandria, and neither teach nor inhabit there;" as Pamphilus[1] relates in the second book of his Apology for Origen, some fragments of which are preserved in Photius. The council of Rome, that was gathered against Novatian, consisted of sixty bishops, and many more[2] presbyters and deacons. The first council of Antioch that was held against Paulus Samosatensis, had also[3] presbyters and deacons in it: the name of one of them, Malchion, a presbyter of Antioch, is still remaining in the Synodical Epistle, among the bishops in the inscription.

From all which it appears, that this was an ancient privilege of presbyters to sit and deliberate with bishops, both in their consistorial and provincial councils. And if we ascend yet higher, we shall find matters always thus transacted in the Church *ab origine;* as appears from Ignatius, whose writings (as a learned man observes[4]) speak as much for the honour of the presbytery, as they do for the superiority of episcopacy; no ancient author having given so

---

[1] Pamphil. Apol. ap. Phot. Cod. 118. p. 298. Σύνοδος ἀθροίζεται ἐπιτκόπων ἢ τινῶν πρεσβυτέρων κατ' Ωριγένες.

[2] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43.

[3] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 28.

[4] Pearson. Vind. Ignat. Par. 2. c. xvi. p. 428. Si quid ego in hâc re intelligo, quicunque presbyterali dignitati auctoritatique maximè student, non habent suæ existimationis firmius aut solidius fundamentum, quàm Epistolas Sancti Ignatii nostri: Neque enim in ullo verè antiquo Scriptore extra has Epistolas tot ac tanta Presbyteratûs præconia invenient, neque illius Ordinis honorem sine Episcopatûs Prærogativâ ullibi constitutum reperient.

many great and noble characters of the presbytery, as he does. For which reason it concerns those, who are most zealous for the honour and authority of presbyters, to look upon Ignatius as one of the best asserters and defenders of their power and reputation. For he always joins the bishops and presbyters together, as presiding over the Church, the one in the place of God and Jesus Christ, and the other as the great council of God in the room of the Apostles. Thus in his Epistle[1] to the Ephesians, he bids them "be subject to the bishop and the presbytery;" and in his Epistle to the Magnesians,[2] he commends Sotion, the deacon, because "he was subject to the bishop, as the gift of God, and to the presbytery, as the law of Christ;" and a little after, in the same Epistle, he speaks of the bishop as presiding[3] in the place of God, and the presbyters in the place of the council of Apostles. So, in his Epistle to the Trallians,[4] he bids them "be subject to the presbytery, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ;" and again, "reverence the[5] presbyters, as the council of God, and the united company of Apostles; without which no Church is called a Church." Several other passages of the same importance may be seen in his Epistles to Polycarp and the Church of Smyrna.[6]

Sect. 9.—The Power of Presbyters thought by some to be a little diminished in the Fourth Century.

And indeed all his Epistles are so full of great eulogiums of the presbytery, as acting in the nature of an ecclesiastical senate together with the bishop, that our late learned defender of those Epistles thence concludes,—that the power and privileges of presbyteries was greater in the second century, when Ignatius lived, than in the fourth age of the Church, when he thinks the powers and authority of pres-

---

[1] Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes. n. 2. Ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς πρεσβυτερίῳ.
[2] Ep. ad. Magnes. n. 2.
[3] Ep. ad Magnes. n. 6. Προκαθήμενα ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον Θεοῦ, ὡς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν Ἀποστόλων.
[4] Ep. ad Trall. n. 2. Ὑποτάσσεσθε τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις.
[5] Ibid. n. 3. Ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ, ὡς ὡς συνδεσμον Ἀποστόλων. Χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται.
[6] Ep. ad Polycarp. n. 7. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8.

teries was a little sunk and diminished over all the world, d even at Alexandria itself, where it had most of all nrished. And this he makes an argument of the antiity of those Epistles, that they were the genuine product Ignatius, because no one of the fourth age would have ven such encomiums of the presbytery, or armed[1] them th so great authority and power. I shall not dispute this tter, nor enter upon any nice comparison of the different wers of presbyters in these two ages, but only represent the reader what privileges still remained to them in the irth century.

ST. 10.—Yet still they were admitted to join with the Bishop in the Imposition of Hands in the Ordination of Presbyters.

And here it cannot be denied, but that in this age, in the dination of a presbyter, all the presbyters that were prent were allowed, nay even required, to join with the bishop imposition of hands upon the party to be ordained. hat it was so in the African Churches, is beyond all dispute; r in the fourth council of Carthage,[2] there is a canon exessly enjoining it; "When a presbyter is ordained, while e bishop pronounces the benediction, and lays his hand on his head, all the presbyters that are present shall lay eir hands by the bishop's hand upon his head also." And is in all likelihood was the universal practice of the Church; r in the Constitutions of the Church of Alexandria,[3] there a rule to the same purpose. In the Latin Church, the ecree of the council of Carthage seems also to have preiiled; because it is inserted into their canon-law by Gratian[4] id other collectors, from whence it became the common

---

[1] Pearson. Vindic. Ignat. Par. 2. c. 16. p. 428. Nemo tam seris Ecclesiæ nporibus---Presbyterium tot laudibus cumulâsset, tantâ auctoritate armâsset, jus Potestas eâ tempestate, etiam Alexandriæ, ubi maximè floruerat, ntoperè imminuta est. [2] Con. Carth. 4. c. 3. Presbyter cùm dinatur, Episcopo eum benedicente, et manum super caput ejus tenente, iam omnes Presbyteri, qui præsentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum Epispi super caput illius teneant. [3] Eccl. Alex. Constit. c. 6. ap. evereg. Not. in Canon. Apost. c. 2. Cùm vult Episcopus ordinare Presbyrum, manum suam capiti ejus imponat, simulque omnes Presbyteri istud ngant. [4] Grat. Dist. 23. c. 8. Ivo. Part. 6. c. 12.

practice of our own Church, which is continued to this day. Some ancient canons[1] indeed say, that one bishop alone shall ordain a presbyter; but that is not said to exclude presbyters from assisting, but only to put a difference between the ordination of a bishop and a presbyter; for the ordination of a bishop could not regularly be performed without the concurrence of three bishops with the metropolitan; but a presbyter might be ordained by a single bishop, without any other assistance, save that of his presbyters joining with him. And this plainly appears to have been the practice of the fourth century.

Sect. 11.—And allowed to sit in Consistory with their Bishops.

It is further evident from the records of the same age, that presbyters had still the privilege of sitting in consistory with their bishops. For Pope Siricius, in the latter end of this century, acted as Cornelius had done before him. When he went about to condemn the errors of Jovinian, he first called[2] a presbytery, and with their advice, censured his doctrines; and then, with the consent of the deacons also and the rest of the clergy, expelled him the Church. And so likewise Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, proceeded against Andronicus, the impious and blaspheming prefect of Pentapolis; he first laid open his horrible crimes before the consistory of his Church, and then with their consent pronounced the sentence of excommunication against him; which he therefore calls the Act of the Consistory[3] or Sanhedrim of Ptolemais, in the circular letters which he wrote to give notice of his excommunication to other Churches. Baronius, indeed, and the common editors of the councils reckon this by mistake among the provincial synods. But it appears evidently from Synesius, that it was only the private consistory of the Church of Ptolemais; for he says

---

[1] Can. Apost. c. 2. Con. Carthag. 3. c. 45.

[2] Siric. Ep. 2. ad Eccles. Mediolan. Facto Presbyterio, constitit Doctrinæ nostræ, id est, Christianæ Legi, esse contraria——Unde omnium nostrorum tam Presbyterorum et Diaconorum, quàm totius Cleri unam scitote fuisse sententiam, ut Jovinianus, Auxentius, &c. in perpetuum damnati, extra Ecclesiam remanerent.

[3] Synes. Ep. 57. p. 190. Νυνὶ δὲ οἶς τὸ συνέδριον μετῆλθε τὴν Ἀνδρονίκου μανίαν, ἀκούσατε.

expressly,[1] "The Church of Ptolemais gave notice of this excommunication to all her sister Churches throughout the world, requiring them to hold Andronicus excommunicated, and not to despise her act, as being only a poor Church in a small city;" which agrees very well with the state of a private consistory, but is not spoken in the style of a provincial council.

SECT. 12.—As also in Provincial Councils.

Yet this is not said with any design to deny that presbyters were allowed to sit in provincial synods; for there are undeniable evidences of their enjoying this privilege within the compass of the fourth century, and after ages also. In the council of Eliberis, which was held in the beginning of the fourth age, there were no less than thirty-six presbyters[2] sitting together with the bishops, as is expressly said in the Acts of the council. The first council of Arles, called by Constantine, had also several presbyters in it, the names of many of which are lost, as are also the names of most of the bishops, who were two hundred; yet the names of fifteen presbyters[3] are still remaining. And it is observable, that in Constantine's *Tractoriæ*, or letters of summons, the presbyters as well as bishops were called by imperial edict to attend at that council; if we may judge of all the rest by that one example, which remains upon record in Eusebius: for there, in the letter sent to summon Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse, orders are given him[4] to bring along with him two of the second throne; which phrase, as has been observed before, denotes two presbyters. So that from hence it is clear, that presbyters were then privileged to sit in council with their bishops, and that by imperial edict. In Justellus's *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici*, there are three or four Roman councils, where the presbyters are particularly mentioned as sitting, and sometimes voting with the bishops. In the council under Hilarius, Anno 491, the presbyters of

[1] Id. Ep. 58. p. 199. [2] Con. Eliber. Procem. Residentibus etiam triginta (al. viginti.) Presbyteris, astantibus Diaconibus et omni Plebe. [3] Con. Arelat. 1. in Catalogo eorum qui Concilio interfuerunt. In Edit. Crab. malè vocat secundum. [4] Euseb. lib. x. c. 5. *Συζεύξας σεαυτῷ καὶ δύο γέ τινας τῶν ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου θρόνου.*

Rome all sat[1] together with the bishops, and the deacons stood by them. So again in the council under Felix, Anno 487,[2] the names of seventy-six presbyters are mentioned that sat together with the bishops in council, the deacons as before standing by them. And in the council under Symmachus, Anno 499, sixty-seven presbyters and six deacons subscribed in the very same form[3] of words as the bishops did. In another council, under the same Symmachus, Anno 502, thirty-six presbyters[4] are named, who sat therein. And in the council under Gregory the Second, Anno 715, the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, all subscribe in the same[5] form to the decrees then published by them all together.

The like instances may be seen in the first councils of Toledo[6] and Bracara,[7] where we may also observe the difference made between presbyters and deacons; that the presbyters are always represented as sitting together with their bishops, but the deacons only standing by to attend them. All which notwithstanding, Cellotius, the Jesuit, and some others of that strain have the confidence to assert, that presbyters were never allowed to sit with bishops in their councils. Bellarmin does[8] not go so far, but only denies them a decisive voice there: in which assertion he is opposed, not only by the generality of protestant writers,[9] but also by Habertus,[10] and other learned defenders[11] of the Gallican liberties in his own communion. So that it is agreed on all hands by unprejudiced writers, and curious

---

[1] Con. Rom. ap. Justel. tom. i. p. 250. Residentibus etiam universis Presbyteris, adstantibus quoque Diaconis, etc. [2] Ibid. p. 255. [3] Ibid. p. 259. Subscripserunt Presbyteri numero sexaginta-septem. Cælius Laurentius Archipresbyter tituli Praxedis hic subscripsi et consensi Synodalibus Constitutis, atque in hâc me profiteor manere sententiâ, etc. [4] Ibid. p. 261. Residentibus etiam Presbyteris, Projectitio, Martino, etc. Adstantibus quoque Diaconis. [5] Ibid. p. 274. Sisinnius Presbyter huic Constituto, à nobis promulgato, subscripsi. Petrus Archidiaconus huic Constituto, à nobis promulgato, subscripsi. [6] Con. Tolet. I. Convenientibus Episcopis in Ecclesiâ—Considentibus Presbyteris, astantibus Diaconis, etc. [7] Con. Bracar. I. Considentibus simul Episcopis, præsentibus quoque Presbyteris, astantibusque Ministris, vel universo Clero. [8] Bellarm. de Concil. lib. i. c. 15. [9] Morton. Apol. Cathol. part 2, lib. iv. c. 8. Whitaker de Concil. Quæst. 3. [10] Habertus Not. in lib. Pontif. Græcor. p. 175. [11] Ranchin's Review of the Council of Trent, lib. i. c. 8.

searchers of antiquity, that presbyters had liberty to sit and deliberate with bishops in provincial councils.

SECT. 13.—And in General Councils likewise.

But as to general or universal councils, there are some protestant writers who seem to make it a dispute, whether presbyters anciently were allowed to sit in them. A learned person[1] of our own Church says, "It was never before heard of that priests did sit in œcumenical councils", meaning, before the council of Lateran, under Callistus the Second, Anno 1123, where six hundred abbots were present. But I see no reason why we may not reckon the first council of Arles a general-council, if a multitude of bishops from all quarters can make it so: for there were two hundred bishops present; and as I noted before, several presbyters were ordered to come along with them. However, the council of Constantinople, Anno 381, is reckoned by all a general-council (though there were but one hundred and fifty bishops in it;) and there we find three presbyters together[2] subscribing among the bishops also. The learned Habertus[3] gives several other instances out of the council of Chalcedon, the second council of Nice, the eighth council called against Photius, and others. From all which, and what has here been alleged, it must be concluded, that presbyters had anciently the privilege of sitting and voting also in general-councils.

SECT. 14.—Of the Titles of Honour given to Presbyters, as well as Bishops, and what Difference there was between them, as applied to both.

These prerogatives of presbyters, being thus allowed in so many cases to act in conjunction with their bishops, advanced their character and reputation very high, and made them of great esteem in the Church: insomuch that many of the same titles of honour which were given to bishops, where with a little variation given to presbyters also. Hence they are called Πρόεδροι, by Synesius[4] and Eusebius;

[1] Bishop Burnet's Vindication of the Ordination, &c. Pref. p. 32.
[2] Con. Constantin. tom. ii. p. 957. Tyrannus, presbyter Amorii: Auxanon, presbyter Apameæ; Helladius, presbyter Commanensis. [3] Habert. Not. in Pontif. p. 175. [4] Synes. Ep. 12. Euseb. lib. x. c. 4.

Προεστῶτες, by Nazianzen[1] and Basil; Προστάται, by Chrysostom[2] and Nazianzen likewise; which names answer to the titles of *Præpositi* and *Antistites* in Latin, and signify presidents, or rulers and governors of the people. I know, indeed, some learned persons[3] are of opinion, that the name *Antistes* is never given to any presbyter by any ancient writer. But this assertion must be understood with a little qualification, otherwise it will not be exactly true; for Hilarius Sardus,[4] speaking of presbyters, against whom a bishop is not to receive an accusation, but before two or three witnesses, gives them expressly the title of *Antistites Dei*. So does also the author[5] of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament, under the name of St. Austin. And though *Præpositi*, in Cyprian's Epistles, commonly signifies bishops, yet it does not always so; for the presbyters of Rome, writing[6] to the clergy of Carthage, style themselves *Præpositi;* and Celerinus,[7] in his Epistle to Lucian, gives them the same title. But Sidonius Apollinaris[8] sets this matter right, when he teacheth us to distinguish between an *Antistes* of the first order, and an *Antistes* of the second; which distinction, whenever presbyters are called *Antistites*, if it be not expressed, is always to be understood. Therefore Blondel argues very loosely, when he would infer from this community of names and titles, that bishops and presbyters were but one and the same order; which might as well be inferred from the name, *Sacerdotes, priests*, which so frequently occurs in the ancient writers, and, as Cyprian observes,[9] denotes an honour common both

---

[1] Naz. Orat. i. Basil. Reg. Moral. 71. [2] Chrys. Hom. 11. in 1 Tim. 4. 1. Naz. Orat. i. p. 37. [3] Bevereg. Not. in Concil. Ancyr. c. 13. Neque enim Presbyter unquam Antistes dicitur. [4] Ambros. al. Hilar. Com. in 1 Tim. v. Hujus Ordinis sublimis honor est; hujusmodi enim Vicarii sunt Christi: Idcirco non facilè de hâc Personâ Accusatio debet admitti. Incredibile enim debet videri, istum qui Dei Antistes est, criminosè versatum.
[5] Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. c. 101. Propter quod Antistites Dei sunt, in Domo Dei et in honore Christi cum dignitate consistunt. [6] Ep. 3. al. 8. ap. Cyprian. Cùm incumbat nobis, qui videmur Præpositi esse, et vice Pastoris custodire Gregem. [7] Celerin. Ep. 21. ap. Cypr. Præceperunt eos Præpositi tantisper sic esse, donec Episcopus constituatur. [8] Sidon. lib. iv. Ep. 11. Antistes fuit Ordine in secundo, fratrem fasce levans Episcopali. [9] Cypr. Ep. 58. al. 61. ad Lucium, p. 145. Presbyteri cum Episcopo sacerdotali honore conjuncti.

o bishops and presbyters: though when there was occasion o speak more accurately and distinctly of bishops, their appropriate title was that of *Summi Sacerdotes, chief priests*, o distinguish them from those of the inferior order, as I have showed before in speaking of the titles of bishops; to which I shall only add here the testimony of Optatus,[1] who gives both bishops, priests, and deacons, the name of priests, and their office the name of priesthood; but with this difference, that the deacons were only in the third degree of priesthood, and the presbyters in the second, but the bishops were the heads and chief of all. From whence it is plain, that if a bare community of names argued an identity of offices, one might as well infer, that bishops and deacons, or presbyters and deacons, were but one and the same order, because they share in the same common titles of priest and priesthood.

SECT. 15.—In what sense Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, called Priests, by Optatus.

If here it be inquired, as it is very natural to ask the question, why Optatus gives all the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, the title of priesthood?—the answer is plain and obvious. Because, according to him every order had its share, though in different degrees, in the Christian priesthood; which is not, as some imagine, a power to offer Christ's body and blood really upon the altar, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead: (which is such a notion of the Christian priesthood, as no ancient author or ritual ever mentions:) but it consists in a power and authority to minister publicly, according to God's appointment, in holy things, or things pertaining to God. And there are several parts of this power, according to the different participation of which, in the opinion of Optatus, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, had each their respective share in the priesthood. Thus it was one act of the priest's

[1] Optat. lib. i. p. 39. Quid commemorem Diaconos in tertio? Quid Presbyteros in secundo Sacerdotio constitutos? Ipsi Apices et Principes omnium, aliqui Episcopi illis temporibus—Instrumenta Divinæ Legis impiè tradiderunt. Confer. Hieron. Epist. 27. Where he calls Presbyters, Secundi Ordinis Sacerdotes.

office to offer up the sacrifice of the people's prayers, praises, and thanksgivings to God, as their mouth and orator, and to make intercession to God for them. Another part of the office was in God's name to bless the people, particularly by admitting them to the benefit and privilege of remission of sins by spiritual regeneration or baptism. And thus far deacons were anciently allowed to minister in holy things, as mediators between God and the people; upon which account a late learned writer[1] joins entirely with Optatus, in declaring deacons to be sharers in this lowest degree of the Christian priesthood. Above this was the power of offering up to God the people's sacrifices at the altar; that is, as Mr. Mede[2] and others explain them, first the eucharistical oblations of bread and wine, to agnize or acknowledge God to be the Lord of the creatures; then the sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving in commemoration of Christ's bloody sacrifice upon the cross, mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine; which whole sacred action was commonly called the Christian's reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, or the sacrifice of the altar. Now the deacons (as we shall see in the next chapter) were never allowed to offer these oblations at the altar, but it was always a peculiar act of the presbyter's office, which was therefore reckoned a superior degree of the priesthood. Another act of the priestly office was to interpret the mind and will of God to the people; as also to bless them solemnly in his name, and upon confession and repentance grant them ministerial absolution: and these being also the ordinary offices of presbyters, they gave them a further title to the priesthood. All these offices, and some more, the bishops[3] could perform, such as the solemn consecration or benediction of persons set apart for the ministry, &c. which, together with their spiritual jurisdiction, or power of ruling and governing the Church, as vicars of Christ, gave them a title to a yet higher degree of the Christian priesthood; whence, as I noted before, they were called chief priests,

[1] Dr. Hick's Discourse of the Christian Priesthood, c. ii. sect. 5. p. 33.
[2] Mede Christ. Sacrif. c. ii. p. 356. Hick's ibid. p. 49, with many others cited by him.
[3] Ἱερουργεῖν τὸ ἐυαγγέλιον Epiphanius calls it, Her. 79. n. 3. See before chap. ii. sect. 6.

Primi Sacerdotes, Summi Sacerdotes, Principes Sacerdotum, and *Pontifices Maximi.* I know, indeed, Albaspiny and several others of the Roman[1] Communion make a distinction between the prelatical and sacerdotal office in a bishop, which is invented to serve some peculiar hypotheses of their own: as first, that a bishop differs nothing from a presbyter as he is a priest; secondly, that bishop and presbyter are but one sacerdotal order; and thirdly, that the proper notion and specific character of the sacerdotal order is a power to offer Christ's body and blood, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead. All which are contrary to the plain sense of antiquity, which knew no such specific character of the sacerdotal order, nor ever dreamt of bishops and presbyters being but one order in reference to the priesthood; but always spake of them as distinct orders, and placed their distinction in their enjoying different powers of the priesthood, making presbyters only *the second order, and second priesthood, Secundus Ordo et Secundum Sacerdotium,* and bishops the first; and asserting that the juridical acts of a bishop were also sacerdotal, or acts of a superior degree of the Christian priesthood peculiar to his order. St. Cyprian[2] scruples not to call such acts *Sacerdotii Vigor, the vigour and power of the episcopal priesthood,* speaking of the power and jurisdiction which he had, as the priest of God, to punish presbyters and deacons that were under him; which he had improperly called the power of his priesthood, had his jurisdiction and priesthood been two different powers in him. This may serve at once to caution the reader against that subtle distinction of the Romanists, and give him a short account both of the nature and different degrees of the Christian priesthood.

SECT. 16.—Why Priests called Mediators between God and Men.

There is another name frequently occurring in the Greek writers, when they speak of Christian priests, which will deserve to be explained: that is the name, Μεσῖται, *mediators* between God and men, a title given them by the author

---

[1] Bellarm. de Cleric. lib. i. c. 11. Canisius Catech. de Sacram. Ord. sect. 4.
[2] Cypr. Ep. xv. al. 20. p. 42. ed. Ox.

of the Constitutions,[1] as also by Origen, Chrysostom, Basil, Isidore of Pelusium, and many others, whose authorities are collected by Cotelerius.[2] The Latin writers are more sparing in the use of this term; for except St. Jerom, Cotelerius could find none that used it. St. Austin is so far from using it, that he condemns it[3] as intolerable in Parmenian the Donatist, who had said, "that the bishop was mediator between God and the people." And indeed there is a sense in which it is intolerable to say, there is any other mediator besides one, the man Christ Jesus. But the Greek fathers used the word in a qualified sense, not for an authentic mediator, or mediator of redemption, who pleads his own merits before God in the behalf of others; but only for a mediator of ministerial intercession, in which sense some of the ancients[4] think Moses is called a mediator by St. Paul, Gal. iii. 19. because he was the *internuncius* to relate the mind of God to the people, and the people's requests and resolutions to God again. And in this qualified sense it is generally[5] owned that Christian priests may be called mediators also, as those that are appointed to convey the people's devotions to God, and the will and blessing of God to the people.

SECT. 17.—The ancient Form and Manner of ordaining Presbyters.

Having thus far spoken of the several offices and titles of presbyters, it remains that I give a short account of the form and manner of their ordination, by which they were invested with their power, and authorized to perform the several duties of their function. Now, as to this it is plain, the ancient form was only imposition of hands and a consecration-prayer. Thus it is described in the canon[6] of the council of Carthage, which has been cited before, and in the author

---

[1] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 25. [2] Coteler. Not. ibid. [3] Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. c. 8. Si Johannes diceret—Mediatorem me habetis apud Patrem, et ego exoro pro peccatis vestris (sicut Parmenianus quodam loco posuit Episcopum, Mediatorem inter Populum et Deum) quis eum ferret bonorum atque fidelium Christianorum? [4] Basil. de Spir. Sto. c. 14. Theodor. Com. in Gal. iii. 19. [5] See Dr. Potter, Ch. Gov. c. v. p. 251. Coteler. Not. in Constit. lib. ii. c. 25. [6] Con. Carth. iv. c. 3. cited before, sect. 10.

ıder the name of Dionysius,[1] who represents it in this anner: he says, "The person to be ordained kneeled be-re the bishop at the altar, and he, laying his hand upon s head, did consecrate him with an holy prayer, and then gned him with the sign of the cross; after which the shop and the rest of the clergy that were present gave m the kiss of peace." The author of the Constitutions[2] eaks also of imposition of hands and prayer, but no more. rom which we may reasonably conclude, that the words hich the Roman Church makes to be the most necessary ıd essential part of a priest's ordination, viz. "Receive ou power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate mass ıth for the living and the dead," were not in any of the ıcient forms of consecration. One of their own writers,[3] orinus, after the most diligent search he could make into ese matters, could find no form for 900 years together, at made any mention of them. And for their other cere-onies superadded to the old ones, other learned writers of at Church do as ingenuously confess the novelty of them. abertus[4] proves against Catumsiritus, that material unction a new thing, and not to be met with in any ancient or-nation; as neither is it in use in the Greek Church at this ıy. So that when Gregory Nazianzen[5] and others speak f an unction, they are to be understood as speaking mysti-ılly of the spiritual unction of the Holy Ghost. Cabassutius[6] oserves the same of the custom of delivering the sacred essels into the hands of the person that was ordained, that owever some plead very stifly for its antiquity, yet it is ally but a modern custom; and he cites Morinus for the ıme opinion. So that I need not stand to show the novelty f these things, which is so evidently proved, as well by e confession of these learned men, as by the silence of all ıcient rituals. But there is one thing the reader may be esirous to know further, viz. what form of words the con-ecration-prayer was conceived in?—To which I must

---

[1] Dionys. de Eccles. Hierarch. c. v. part 2. p. 364. [2] Constit. Apost. , viii. c. 16. [3] See Bishop Burnet of Ordination, p. 24, who cites orinus. [4] Habert. Observ. in Pontif. Græc. p. 386. [5] Naz, rat. v. p. 136. [6] Cabassut. Notit. Concil. c. 43.

answer, as I have done before about bishops, that there was no such general form then extant; but every bishop having liberty to frame his own liturgy, he used such a form as he thought convenient, in his own Church; it being a thing indifferent, as a learned person[1] observes, so the substance of the blessing were preserved. The only form now remaining is that which is extant in the Constitutions, which because it will show the reader what was then the substance of the benediction, I will here insert the words of it, which are these: "Look, O Lord, upon this thy servant, who is chosen into the presbytery by the suffrage and judgment of all the clergy, and fill him with the Spirit of grace and counsel, that he may help and govern thy people with a pure heart; in like manner as Thou hadst respect to thy chosen people, commanding Moses to make choice of elders, whom Thou didst replenish with thy Spirit. And now, Lord, do the same thing, preserving in us the never-failing Spirit of thy grace; that he being full of healing powers and instructive discourse, may with meekness teach thy people, and serve Thee sincerely with a pure mind, and willing soul, and unblameably perform the sacred services[2] for thy people, through Christ, &c." Where we may observe, that it was not then thought necessary to express all or any of the offices of a presbyter in particular, but only in general to pray for grace to be given to the priest then ordained, whereby he might be enabled to perform them. And this, with a solemn imposition of hands, was reckoned a sufficient form of consecration; which I note for the instruction of those who may be apt to think that modern forms of ordination are in every circumstance like the primitive ones; whereas, if Morinus says true, the words which are now most in use, viz. "Receive the Holy Ghost," were not in the Roman pontifical above 400 years ago: which makes good the observation of a learned person,[3] "That the Church Catholic did never agree on one uniform ritual, or book of ordination, but that was still left to the freedom

---

[1] Bishop Burnet's Vindication of the Ordination, &c. p. 25. Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 16. Τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ἱερουργίας ἀμώμους ἐκτελῇ.
[2] Bishop Burnet's Vind. of the Ordination, p. 35.

particular Churches; and so the Church of England had much power to make or alter rituals, as any other had.

SECT. 18.—Of the *Archipresbyteri.*

I should here have ended this chapter about presbyters, it that it is necessary to give some account of the *Archipresbyteri*, and *Seniores Ecclesiæ*, which are sometimes entioned in ancient writers. The archpresbyters are oken of by St. Jerom,[1] who seems to say there was one, d but one in every Church; and perhaps he is the first thor that mentions them. After him Socrates[2] speaks of e Peter, protopresbyter of Alexandria, whom Sozomen[3] lls archpresbyter. And Liberatus[4] mentions one Proteas, archpresbyter, in the same Church; from whom we so learn, in some measure, what was the office and quality the archpresbyter. He was not always the senior presyter of the Church, as some are apt to imagine, but one osen out of the college of presbyters, at the pleasure of e bishop; for Liberatus says expressly, that Dioscorus, e bishop, made Proterius archpresbyter of the Church; hich implies that he did not come to the office by virtue of s seniority, but by the bishop's appointment. As to his fice, it is plain from Liberatus, that it was to preside over e Church next under the bishop, as chief of the college f presbyters, and to take care of all things relating to the hurch in the bishop's absence; as Proterius is said to ave done, while Dioscorus went to the council of Chalcedon. And therefore some,[5] not without reason, think these *rchipresbyteri* were much of the same nature with our eans in Cathedral-Churches, as the college of presbyters ere the chapter. But they wholly mistake the matter, ho[6] confound these *Archipresbyteri* with the *Cardinales resbyteri*; for that is a name of much later date, not to

[1] Hieron. Ep. 4. ad Rustic. Singuli Ecclesiarum Episcopi, singuli Archipresbyteri, singuli Archidiaconi. [2] Socrat. lib. vi. c. 9. Πίτρος τὶς ρεσβύτερος. [3] Sozom. lib. viii. c. 12. [4] Liberat. Breiar. c. 14. Proterio Dioscorus commendavit Ecclesiam, qui et eum Archipresbyterum fecerat. In Edit. Crab. malè legitur Archiepiscopum. [5] Stillingfleet Irenic. part ii. c. 7. p. 358. [6] Onuphr. Interpret. Vocum Ecclesiast. Salmas. de Primat. c. i. p. 10.

be found in any genuine writer till the time of Gregory the Great: for the council of Rome, which is the only authority that Bellarmin[1] alleges to prove it more ancient, is a mere fiction. Besides that the cardinal presbyters were many in the same Church or city, but the archpresbyter was but one. So that whatever was the first original of cardinal presbyters (whether they were so called from their being fixed in some principal Churches, where baptism might be administered, which were therefore called *Ecclesiæ vel Tituli Cardinales*, as Bellarmin thinks; or whether, as others[2] imagine, when the number of presbyters was grown so great in large and populous cities, that they could not conveniently meet, and join with the bishop, for ordering the government of the Church, there were some as the chief of them chosen out from the rest, to be as the bishop's council, who were therefore called *Cardinales Presbyteri*;—a dispute that does not concern me any further to inquire into or determine;) I say, whatever was their rise, or the reason of their name, it is certain they were not the same with the *Archipresbyteri* of the primitive Church.

SECT. 19.—Of the *Seniores Ecclesiastici*. That these were not Lay-Elders in the Modern Acceptation.

As to the *Seniores Ecclesiæ*, they were a sort of elders, who were not of the clergy, yet had some concern in the care of the Church. The name often occurs in Optatus and St. Austin, from whom we may easily learn the nature of their office. Optatus says,[3] when Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, was forced to leave his Church in the time of the Diocletian persecution, he committed the ornaments and utensils of the Church to such of the elders as he could trust, "*Fidelibus Senioribus commendavit.*" Upon which Albaspiny[4] notes, "that besides the clergy there were then some lay-elders, who were entrusted to take care of the goods of the Church." At the end of Optatus there is

[1] Bellar. de Cleric. lib. i. c. 16. [2] Stillingfl. ibid. [3] Optat. lib. i. p. 41. [4] Albaspin. Not. in Optat. p. 123. Præter Ecclesiasticos et Clericos, quidam ex Plebe Seniores et probatæ vitæ res Ecclesiæ curabant.

tract called, The Purgation of Felix and Cæcilian, where-
ı there are several Epistles that make mention of the same
ame, as that of Fortis[1] and Purpurius, and another name-
ess author. St. Austin inscribes one of his Epistles[2] to
is own Church of Hippo in this manner, *Clero, Senioribus,
t universæ Plebi, To the clergy, the elders, and all the
eople;* and in several other places[3] has occasion to men-
ion these *Seniores* in other Churches.

From whence some[4] have concluded, that these were
uling lay-elders, according to the new model and modern
cceptation. Whereas, as the ingenious author[5] of the
Iumble Remonstrance rightly observes in his reply, those
Seniores of the primitive Church were quite another thing.
Some of them were the *Optimates, the chief men* or *magis-
rates* of the place, such as we still call aldermen, from the
ncient appellation of *Seniores.* These are those which the
Zabarsiessitan council of Donatists, in St. Austin, calls[6]
Seniores Nobilissimi; and one of the councils[7] of Carthage
nore expressly, *Magistratus vel Seniores locorum, the ma-
istrates or elders of every city;* whom the bishops were
o take with them to give the Donatists a meeting. In this
ense Dr. Hammond[8] observes from Sir Henry Spelman,
nd some of our Saxon writings, that anciently our Saxon
ings had the same title of elders, *Aldermanni, Presbyteri,*
nd *Seniores;* as in the Saxon translation of the Bible, the
word, princes, is commonly rendered, aldermen. And of
his sort were some of those *Seniores Ecclesiæ,* that have

---

[1] Gest. Purgat. Cæcil. et Fel. p. 268. ex Epist. Fortis: Omnes vos Episopi, Presbyteri, Diacones, Seniores, scitis, &c. Ibid. ex Epist. Purpurii: Adhibete Conclericos, et Seniores Plebis, Ecclesiasticos Viros, et inquiıat diligenter, quæ sunt istæ dissensiones. Ibid. Clericis et Senioribus irthensium in Domino æternam salutem. [2] Aug. Ep. 137. Id. cont. Crescon. lib. iii. c. 29 et 56. Concio. 2 in Psal. xxxvi. p. 120. Smectymn. Answer to the Remonstrance, p. 74. [5] Hamon l'Estrange efence of the Remonstrance. [6] Aug. Conc. ii. in Psal. xxxvi. p. 90. [7] Con. Carthag. Anno 403. in Con. Aphrican. c. 58. et in od. Can. Eccl. Afr. c. 91. Debere unumquemque nostrûm in Civitate suâ er se convenire Donatistarum Præpositos, aut adjungere sibi vicinum Collean, ut pariter eos in singulis quibusque, Civitatibus vel Locis, per Magisatus vel Seniores Locorum conveniant. [8] Ham. Dissert. 4. ıat. Blondel. c. 19. n. 1.

been mentioned, whose advice and assistance also, no doubt, the bishops took in many weighty affairs of the Church. The other sort, which were more properly called *Seniores Ecclesiastici*, were such as were sometimes trusted with the utensils, treasure, and outward affairs of the Church; and may be compared to our church-wardens, vestry-men, stewards, who have some care of the affairs of the Church, but are not concerned as ruling elders in the government or discipline thereof. Now, lay-elders are a degree above the deacons; but the *Seniores Ecclesiæ* were below them; which is a further evidence, that they were not lay-elders in the modern acceptation. But of this enough. I now proceed to consider the third order of the clergy in the primitive Church, which is that of deacons.

CHAP. XX.

Of Deacons.

SECT. I.—Deacons always reckoned One of the Three Sacred Orders of the Church.

THE name Διάκονοι, which is the original word for *deacons*, is sometimes used in the New Testament, for any one that ministers in the service of God; in which large sense we sometimes find bishops and presbyters styled deacons, not only in the New Testament,[1] but in ecclesiastical writers[2] also. But here we take it in a more strict sense for the name on the third order of the clergy of the primitive Church. In treating of which it will be necessary in the first place to show the sense of antiquity concerning their original. The council of Trullo advances a very singular notion about this matter, asserting, "that the seven deacons spoken of in the Acts, are not to be understood of such as ministered[3] in divine service or the sacred mysteries,

[1] Act. i. 25. 2 Cor. vi. 4. 2 Tim. iv. 5. 1 Cor. iii. 5. Eph. iii. 7. — [2] Athan. cont. Gent. Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Phil. i. 1. [3] Con. Trull. c. 16. Ἑπτὰ Διακόνους μὴ ἐπὶ τῶν τοῖς μυστηρίοις διακονεῖν λαμβάνεσθαι.

but only of such as served tables and attended the poor." But the whole current of antiquity runs against this. Ignatius[1] styles them expressly "ministers of the mysteries of Christ," adding, "that they are not ministers of meats and drinks, but of the Church of God." In another[2] place he speaks of them as ministers of Jesus Christ, and gives them a sort of presidency over the people, together with the bishop and presbyters. "Study to do all things," says he, "in divine concord, under your bishop presiding in the place of God, and the presbyters in the place of the apostolical senate, and the deacons, most dear to me, as those to whom is committed the ministry of Jesus Christ." And in many other[3] places he requires the people to be "subject to them, and reverence them as Jesus Christ," that is, as his ministers attending on his service. Cyprian speaks of them in the same style, calling them[4] "ministers of episcopacy and the Church;" withal referring their original to the place in the Acts of the Apostles, which the council of Trullo disputes about, at the same time that he asserts[5] they were called, *Ad Altaris Ministerium, to the ministry and service of the altar.*" Tertullian[6] was so far from thinking them only ministers of meats and drinks, that he joins them with bishops and priests in the honourable titles of guides and leaders of the laity, and makes them in their degree pastors and overseers of the flock of Christ. And so St. Jerom, though he sometimes in an angry humour speaks a little contemptuously of them, styling them[7] "ministers of widows and tables;" yet in other places[8] he treats them with greater respect, giving them the same honourable title as Tertullian does, and ranking them among the guides of the people. I showed before in the last chapter, that Optatus[9] had so

---

[1] Ignat. Ep. ad Trall. n. 2. [2] Epist. ad Magnes. n. 6.
[3] Epist. ad Polycarp. n. 6. Ep. ad Trall. n. 3. [4] Cypr. Ep. 65. al. 3. ad Rogatian. Diaconos post Ascensum Domini in cœlos Apostoli sibi constituerunt, Episcopatûs sui et Ecclesiæ Ministros. [5] Id. Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Plieb. Legion. et Astur. p. 172. [6] Tert. de Fugâ. c. 11. Quum ipsi Autores, id est, ipsi Diaconi, Presbyteri et Episcopi fugiunt, quomodò Laicus intelligere poterit, &c. Cùm Duces fugiunt, quis de gregario numero sustinebit? [7] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. et Com. in Ezek. c. 48. Mensarum et Viduarum Ministri. [8] Id. Comm. in Mich. 7. Nolite credere in Ducibus, non in Episcopo, non in Presbytero, non in Diacono. [9] Optat. lib. i.

great an opinion of them, as to reckon their office a lower degree of the priesthood. And St. Austin seems to have had the same sentiments; for in one of his Epistles[1] he gives Præsidius the title of *Consacerdos, his fellow priest,* whom yet St. Jerom, in the next Epistle,[2] calls a deacon.

SECT. 2.—Yet not generally called Priests, but Ministers and Levites.

Yet here, that I may not seem to impose upon my readers, I must observe that the name of priests was not generally given to the deacons, by those that esteemed them a sacred order; but they are commonly distinguished from priests by the names of ministers and Levites. Thus St. Jerom[3] distinguishes them from the priests of the second order, that is, from the presbyters, by the title of Levites. The author of the Questions[4] upon the Old and New Testament under the name of St. Austin, and Hilarius Sardus[5] under the name of St. Ambrose, are more positive and express in denying them the name of priests. And Salvian,[6] though he acknowledges their ministration and function to be about holy things, yet he gives them but the same title of Levites, and that in contradiction to the priests. And so frequently in the councils[7] the names, *Sacerdos* and *Levita*, are used as the peculiar distinguishing titles of presbyters and deacons. The fourth council of Carthage[8] speaks more expressly, "that deacons are not ordained to the priesthood, but only to the ministering office, or inferior service." And hence the Canons sometimes give them the name of Ὑπηρέται and *Ministri, the ministers* and *servants,* not only of the Church, but of the bishops and presbyters,

---

[1] Aug. Ep. 16. [2] Hieron. Ep. 17. inter Epist. Aug. [3] Hieron. Ep. 27. Episcopi, et Sacerdotum inferioris gradûs, ac Levitarum innumerabilis multitudo. [4] Aug. Quæst. Vet. et N. Test. tom. iv. Q. 46. Nunquid Diaconus potest vicem gerere Sacerdotis. —— Sacerdotis vicem agere non potest, qui non est Sacerdos. [5] Hilar. Com. in Ephes. 4. Evangelistæ Diaconi sunt, sicut fuit Philippus, quamvis non sint Sacerdotes. [6] Salvian. ad Eccles. Cathol. lib. ii. p. 394. Levitis ac Sacerdotibus tantâ divinarum rerum administratione fungentibus. [7] Con. Turon. 1. can. 2. [8] Con. Carth. 4. c. 4. Diaconus non ad Sacerdotium, sed ad Ministerium consecratur.

as may be seen in the council[1] of Nice, and Carthage,[2] and many others. Whence some learned men[3] conclude against Optatus and St. Austin, that deacons were in no sense allowed to be priests: whilst others[4] with Optatus distinguish the several degrees of the priesthood, and reckon, that though deacons were not absolutely called priests, because that was the appropriate title of bishops and presbyters, whose ministers and attendants they were; yet deacons sometimes performed such offices, as did entitle them to a lower degree of priesthood. Having thus fairly stated and represented the matter on both sides, I must leave the judicious reader to determine for himself which opinion has the strongest reasons, whilst I proceed to give an account of the ordination of deacons, and their several offices, and such laws and rules as concerned their order.

Sect. 3.—For this Reason the Bishop was not tied to have the Assistance of any Presbyters to ordain them.

The ordination of a deacon differed from that of a presbyter, both in the form and manner of it, and also in the gifts and powers that were conferred thereby. For in the ordination of a presbyter, as has been noted before, the presbyters who were present, were required to join in the imposition of hands with the bishop: but the ordination of a deacon might be performed by the bishop alone, because, as the council of Carthage[5] words it, "he was ordained not to the priesthood, but to the inferior services of the Church." These services are not particularly mentioned in the form of ordination now remaining in the Constitutions; but there the bishop only prays in general, "That God would[6] make his face to shine upon that his servant, who was then chosen to the office of a deacon, and fill him with his Holy Spirit

---

[1] Con. Nic. c. 18. Τῷ μεν ἐπισκόπῳ ὑπηρέται εἰσίν. [2] Con. Carth. iv. c. 37. Diaconus ita se Presbyteri, ut Episcopi, Ministrum esse cognoscat. Vid. Con. Eliber. in Titulis Can. 18 et 33. Con. Turon. i. c. 1. [3] Bp. Fell. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 18. Habert. Not. in Pontific. p. 125. [4] Rigalt. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 33. Dr. Hicks Disc. on Priesthood, p. 33. [5] Con. Carth. 4. c. 4. Diaconus quum ordinatur, solus Episcopus, qui eum benedicit, manum super caput illius ponat: quia non ad Sacerdotium, sed ad Ministerium consecratur. [6] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 18.

and power, as he did Stephen the martyr; that he behaving himself acceptably and uniformly and unblamably in his office, might be thought worthy of a higher degree, &c." What, therefore, were the particular offices of the deacons, we are to learn not from the forms of the Church, but from other writers.

SECT. 4.—The Deacon's Office to take Care of the Utensils of the Altar.

Where we find first, that the most ordinary and common office of the deacons was to be subservient and assistant to the bishop and presbyters in the service of the altar. It belonged to them to take care of the holy table, and all the ornaments and utensils appertaining thereto. The author, under the name of St. Austin,[1] takes notice of this as the common office of deacons in all Churches, except in such great Churches as the Church of Rome, where there being a multitude of inferior clergy, this office was devolved on some of them: but in other Churches it was the deacon's office, where the inferior clergy, sub-deacons, &c. were prohibited by Canon to come into the sanctuary, or touch any of the sacred vessels in the time of divine service, as may be seen in several canons[2] of the ancient councils.

SECT. 5.—2. To receive the Oblations of the People, and present them to the Priest, and recite the Names of those that offered.

Another part of the deacon's office was to receive the people's offerings, and present them to the priest, who presented them to God at the altar; after which the deacon repeated the names of those that offered, publicly. And this rehearsal was commonly called "*offerre nomina*," as may be seen in Cyprian,[3] who speaks of it as part of the communion service of those times; which is also noted by

---

[1] Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. tom. iv. c. 101. Ut autem non omnia ministeria obsequiorum per ordinem agant, multitudo facit Clericorum. Nam utique et Altare portarent, et vasa ejus, et aquam in manus funderent Sacerdoti, sicut videmus per omnes Ecclesias. [2] Con. Agathen. c. 66. Non oportet in sacratos Ministros licentiam habere, in Secretarium (quod Græci Diaconicon appellant) ingredi et contingere Vasa Dominica. Con. Laodic. c. 21. cum Notis Balsamon. et Zonar. in loc. [3] Cypr. Ep. 10. al. 16. p. 37. Ad communicationem admittuntur, et offertur nomen eorum, etc.

Rigaltius[1] and others; of which custom I shall say more hereafter, when we come to treat of the ancient service of the Church. At present I only observe, that this recital of the names of such as made their oblations was part of the deacon's office, as is evident from St. Jerom, who tells us,[2] "that extortioners and oppressors made their oblations out of their ill-gotten goods, that they might glory in their wickedness, while the deacon in the Church publicly recites the names of those that offered; such an one offers so much, such an one hath promised so much: and so they please themselves with the applause of the people, while their conscience secretly lashes and torments them." Some, indeed, deny that there was any such custom as this public and particular rehearsal of men's names that offered in the Church, and by consequence that this was any part of the deacon's office: but I think St. Jerom's testimony is undeniable proof, and cannot otherwise be expounded, to make any tolerable sense of his words; for which reason I have made this one part of the deacon's office, though contrary to the judgment of some learned men.

SECT. 6.—3. To read the Gospel in some Churches.

In some Churches, but not in all, the deacons read the Gospel both in the Communion-service, and before it also. The author of the Constitutions assigns all other parts of Scripture to the readers, but the Gospel is to be read[3] only by a presbyter or a deacon. St. Jerom intimates[4] that it was part of the deacon's function; and so it is said by the council of Vaison, which authorises deacons to read the Homilies of the ancient Fathers in the absence of a presbyter, assigning this reason for it: "If the deacons be worthy to read[5] the discourses of Christ in the Gospel, why should

[1] Rigalt. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 60. Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. 8. n. 7.
[2] Hieron. Com. in Ezek. 18. p. 537. Multos conspicimus, qui opprimunt per potentiam, vel furta committunt, ut de multis parva pauperibus tribuant, et in suis sceleribus glorientur, publicèque Diaconus in Ecclesiâ recitet Offerentium Nomina: tantum offert ille, tantum ille pollicitus est, placentque sibi ad plausum populi, torquente conscientiâ.
[3] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57.
[4] Hieron. Ep. 57. ad Sabin. Evangelium Christi quasi Diaconus lectitabas.
[5] Con. Valens. ii. c. 2. Si digni sunt Diaconi, quæ Christus in Evangelio

they not be thought worthy to read the expositions of the holy Fathers?" This implies, that in the western Churches it was the ordinary office of the deacons to read the Gospels, but in other Churches the custom varied: for as Sozomen observes, it was customary at Alexandria for the archdeacon only to read the Gospels; in other Churches the deacons; in others the priests only; and in some Churches on high festivals the bishop himself read, as at Constantinople on Easter-day. In the African Churches, in the time of Cyprian, the readers were allowed to read the Gospels as well as other parts of Scripture, as appears from one of Cyprian's Epistles, where speaking of Celerinus, the confessor, whom he had ordained a reader, he says, "It was fitting he should be advanced to the pulpit[1] or tribunal of the Church (as they then called the reading desk) that he might thence read the precepts and Gospels of his Lord, which he himself like a courageous confessor, had followed and observed." So that we are not to look upon this to have been the deacon's peculiar office, but only in some Churches and some ages.

SECT. 7.—4. To minister the consecrated Elements of Bread and Wine to the People in the Eucharist.

But it was something more appropriate to them to assist the bishop or presbyters in the administration of the eucharist; where their business was to distribute the elements to the people that were present, and carry them to those that were absent also, as Justin Martyr[2] acquaints us in his second Apology. The author of the Constitutions[3] likewise, describing the manner of the ancient service, divides the whole action between the bishop and the deacon; appointing the bishop to deliver the bread to every communicant singly, saying, "the body of Christ:" and the deacon in like manner to deliver the cup, saying, "the blood of Christ, the

---

locutus est legere, quare indigni judicentur Sanctorum Patrum Expositiones publicè recitare? [1] Cypr. Ep. 34. al. 39. Quid aliud quàm super Pulpitum, id est, super Tribunal Ecclesiæ oportebat imponi, ut loci altioris celsitate subnixus—legat Præcepta et Evangelia Domini, quæ fortiter ac fideliter sequitur. [2] Just. M. Apol. ii. p. 97. [3] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 13.

cup of life." This the author, under the name of St. Austin,[1] calls the proper office of the deacons' order. Yet it was not so proper to their order, but that they were to depend upon the will and licence of the bishop and the presbyters, if they were present; as is expresly provided in some of the ancient[2] councils, which forbid the deacon to give the eucharist in the presence of a presbyter, except necessity require, and he have his leave to do it. And therefore it was looked upon as a great absurdity for a presbyter to sit by and receive the sacrament from the hands of a deacon, as was sometimes practised, but the council of Nice[3] made a severe canon against it. So that, what was allowed to deacons, was not to consecrate the eucharist, but only to distribute it, and that not to the bishop and presbyters, but only to the people. Yet this action of theirs is sometimes called oblation or offering, as in Cyprian[4] and the council of Ancyra,[5] which forbids some deacons that were under censure, "*ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν, to offer either the bread or wine,*" as deacons otherwise were allowed to do.

SECT. 8.—But not allowed to consecrate them at the Altar.

Some learned[6] persons, I know, put a different sense upon the words of this council; they understand, by offering, consecration, and thence conclude, that deacons anciently were invested with the ordinary power of consecrating the eucharist in the absence of the presbyters. But this is more than can fairly be deduced from the words, which are capable of two more reasonable constructions; either they may signify the deacon's offering the people's oblations to the priest, which was a part of their office, (as I showed before,) and so Petavius[7] and Herbertus understand them; or else they may be interpreted by Cyprian's words, who ex-

---

[1] Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. c. 101. Diaconi Ordo est accipere à Sacerdote, et sic dare Plebi. [2] Con. Carth. iv. 38. Diaconus, præsente Presbytero, Eucharistiam Corporis Christi populo, si necessitas cogat, jussus eroget. Vid. Con. Arelat. ii. c. 15. [3] Con. Nic. can. 18. [4] Cypr. de Lapsis, p. 132. Solemnibus adimpletis, Calicem Diaconus offerre præsentibus cœpit. [5] Con. Ancyr. c. 2. [6] Hospin. Hist. Sacram. lib. ii. c. 1. p. 23. [7] Petav. Diatrib. de Potest. Consecr. c. 3. tom. iv. p. 211. Habert. in Pontifical. par. 9. observ. 2. p. 190.

presses himself more fully, calling it, "offering the consecrated bread and wine to the people;" which seems to be the most natural sense, and is preferred to all others by some late learned[1] writers. Whatever it be, there is no reason to believe it means, that deacons were allowed the ordinary power of consecration; for the council of Nice, which was not long after the council of Ancyra, says expressly,[2] that deacons had not power to offer, that is, in the sense in which offering signifies consecration; for in that sense it was the proper office of presbyters. Some deacons indeed did about this time take upon them thus to offer, but the council of Arles, which was held in the same year with that of Ancyra, reckons it a presumption and transgression of their rule, and therefore made a new[3] canon to restrain them. St. Hilary is a good witness of the practice of the Church in his own time, and he assures us, there could be no sacrifice or consecration of the Eucharist without a presbyter.[4] And St. Jerom says the same,[5] "that presbyters were the only persons, whose prayers consecrated bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ." For which reason, speaking of one Hilary, a deacon, he says, "he could not consecrate the eucharist,[6] because he was only a deacon." The reason of this was, because the holy eucharist was looked upon as the prime Christian sacrifice, and one of the highest offices of the Christian priesthood; and deacons being generally reckoned no priests, or but in the lowest degree, they were therefore forbidden to offer or consecrate this sacrifice at the altar. This reason is assigned by the author[7] of the Constitutions, and the author under the name of St. Austin, and several others.

---

[1] Suicer. Thesaur. tom. i. p. 871. [2] Con. Nic. c. 18. Τὴς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν, etc. [3] Con. Arelat. 1. c. 15. De Diaconibus, quos cognovimus multis locis offerre, placuit minimè fieri debere. [4] Hilar. Fragm. p. 129. Sacrificii opus sine Presbytero esse non potuit. [5] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Quid patitur Mensarum et Viduarum Minister, ut supra eos tumidus se efferat, ad quorum preces Christi corpus et sanguis conficitur? [6] Id. Dial. cont. Lucif. p. 145. Hilarius cùm Diaconus de Ecclesiâ recesserit, solusque ut putat turba sit mundi: Neque Eucharistiam conficere potest, Episcopos et Presbyteros non habens, etc. [7] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 28 Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. Q. 46.

there is a passage in St. Ambrose, which seems to te, that, in the third century, the deacons at Rome had to consecrate the eucharist; for speaking of Lauren- ıe deacon, he brings him in thus addressing himself tus his bishop, as he was going to his martyrdom; ither go you, holy priest, without your deacon? you ɔt use to offer sacrifice without your minister; why ɔu then now displeased with me? why may I not be ır with you in shedding my blood, who was used to con- e[1] the blood of Christ by your commission, and be your ır in consummating the holy mysteries?" Baronius ɔ perplexed with this difficulty, that he resolves it to be ıption of the text, and that instead of "*consecrationem*," ıld be read[2] "*dispensationem*:" and some shameless s have without any grounds, made bold to foist this tion into the text; which Bona[3] and Habertus inge- ly condemn, as done against the authority of all the as well as former editions, and that without any ı for it from the difficulty of the expression. For the consecration, in this place does not signify the sacra- l consecration of the element, by prayer at the altar, was performed by the bishop himself, as appears ıtly from the context, where it is said, the bishop was used to offer sacrifice without his minister or deacon; ore the consecration, which was committed to the deacon, ɔe of another sort; for he could not offer or consecrate ements on the altar in the bishop's presence, and at the time that the bishop himself consecrated; but he might him, or bear a part with him, as it is there worded, nsummating the holy mysteries, that is in giving the ith the usual form of words to the people; which in nguage of those times, was called a ministerial conse- n, or consummation, of the sacrament, forasmuch as eceivers were hereby consecrated with the blood of

---

ıbros. de Offic. lib. i. c. 41. Quo, Sacerdos sanct, sine Diacono pro- Nunquam sacrificium sine Ministro offerre consueveras. Quid in me splicuit, Pater?—Cui commisisti Dominici sanguinis consecrationem? ısummandorum Consortium Sacramentorum? Huic consortium tu san- ıegas? [2] Baron. an. 261. n. 7. [3] Bona Rer. Liturg. :. 25. n. 4. Habert. Not. in Pontifical. Græc. p. 191.

Christ, and also consummated or made perfect partakers of the sacrament in both kinds, having received the bread from the hands of the bishop, and the cup from the hands of the deacon. This is plainly the consecration here spoken of, which refers only to the deacon's ministering of the cup to the people, which was their usual office, and so cannot be made an argument, as Hospinian, and Grotius[1] would have it, that deacons were allowed to consecrate the eucharist at the altar.

SECT. 9.—5. Deacons allowed to Baptize, in some Places.

But for the other sacrament of baptism, it is more evident that they were permitted in some cases to administer it solely. For though the author[2] of the Constitutions says, "that the deacons did neither baptize, nor offer;" and Epiphanius[3] affirms universally, "that the deacons were not entrusted with the sole administration of any sacrament;" yet it appears from other writers, that they had this power, at least in some places, ordinarily conferred upon them. Tertullian[4] invests them with the same right as presbyters, that is, to baptize by the bishop's leave, and St. Jerom[5] entitles them to the very same privilege. The council of Eliberis[6] as plainly asserts this right, when it says, "If a deacon, that takes care of a people, without either bishop, or presbyter, baptizes any, the bishop shall consummate them by his benediction." This plainly supposes, that deacons had the ordinary right of baptizing in such Churches over which they presided. So when Cyril[7] directs his catechumens, how they should behave themselves at the time of baptism, when they came either before a bishop, or presbyter, or deacon,

---

[1] Vid. Grot. De Cœnæ Administratione ubi Pastores non sunt.—Cited and confuted by Petavius. [2] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 28. [3] Epiphan. Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 4. [4] Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17. Dandi quidem habet jus Summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus; dehinc Presbyteri et Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, etc. [5] Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. c. 4. p. 139. Inde venit, ut sine jussione Episcopi, neque Presbyter neque Diaconus jus habeant Baptizandi. [6] Concil. Eliber. c. 77. Si quis Diaconus, regens Plebem sine Episcopo vel Presbytero, aliquos baptizaverit, Episcopus eos per Benedictionem perficere debebit. [7] Cyril. Catech. 17. n. 17.

ty or in village,—this may be presumed a fair inti-
on, that then deacons were ordinarily allowed to min-
baptism in country places. I speak only now of
ordinary power; for as to extraordinary cases, not
deacons, but the inferior clergy, and laymen also, were
tted to baptize in the primitive Church, as will be
ed in its proper place.

SECT. 10.—6. Deacons to bid Prayer in the Congregation.

nother office of the deacons was to be a sort of monitors
directors to the people in the exercise of their public
tions in the Church, to which purpose they were wont
e certain known forms of words, to give notice when
part of the service began, and to excite the people to
attentively therein; also to give notice to the catechu-
s, penitents, energumens, when to come up and make
prayers, and when to depart; and in several prayers
repeated the words before them, to teach them what they
to pray for. All this was called by the general name of
ήττειν, among the Greeks, and *Prædicare*, among the
ns; which does not ordinarily signify preaching, as
e mistake it, but performing the office of a Κήρυξ, or
co, in the assembly: whence Synesius[1] and some
rs call the deacons Ἱεροκήρυκες, *the holy cryers* of the
rch, as those that gave notice to the congregation how
ings were regularly to be performed. Thus the word
ξαι frequently occurs in the ancient rituals and canons:
the Apostolical Constitutions, as soon as the bishop
ended his sermon, the deacon is to cry, "Let the
ers[2] and unbelievers depart." Then he is to bid the
chumens pray, and to call upon the faithful also to pray
hem, repeating a form of bidding prayer, to instruct the
ple after what manner they were to pray for them;
ch form may be seen both in the Constitutions,[3] and in
Chrysostom.[4] After this the deacon was to call in like
ner upon the energumens, the *competentes*, and the

---

ynes. Ep. 67. p. 224. Chrysost. Hom. 17. in Heb. 9. Κήρυξ ὅταν τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις. [2] Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 5. Κηρυττέτω, τῶν ἀκροωμένων. Μή τις τῶν ἀπίστων. [3] Ibid. c. 6. [4] Chrys. . 2. in 2 Cor.

penitents, in their several orders, using the solemn words of exhortation, both to them and the people, to pray for them, "Ἐκτενῶς δεηθῶμεν, *let us ardently pray for them.*" Then again, when the deacon had dismissed all these by a solemn cry, "Ἀπολύεσθε, προέλθετε," or, "*Ite, Missa est,*" he called upon the faithful to pray again for themselves, and the whole state of Christ's Church, repeating[1] another form of bidding prayer before them. And this is there called the deacon's Προσφώνησις, or *exhortation to pray*, to distinguish it from the bishop's Ἐπίκλησις, which was a direct form of address to God, whereas the deacon's address was to the people; for which reason it was called Προσφώνησις, and Κηρύξαι, *bidding the people to pray*, or, *a call and exhortation to pray*, with directions what they should pray for in particular. This the Latins call both *Oratio* and *Prædicatio*, as may be seen in one of the councils of Toledo,[2] which explains the word *orare* by *prædicare*, making them both to signify this office of the deacon. And hence one of the deacon's ornaments (that I may note this by the way) is called by the same council, his *Orarium*, because he used it sometimes as a private signal, to give notice of the prayers to his brethren of the clergy. By all this we may understand what Socrates means, when he says Athanasius[3] commanded his deacon "κηρύξαι εὐχην, *to bid prayer;*" and how we are to interpret that controverted canon of the council of Ancyra, which, speaking of some deacons that had lapsed into idolatry, and degrading them, says, they should[4] no longer "κηρύσσειν," which some interpret, *preaching;* but others[5] more truly understand it of this part of the deacon's office, which was to be the Κῆρυξ or *Præco, the sacred cryer of the congregation.*

SECT. 11.—7. Deacons allowed to preach by the Bishop's Authority.

If it be inquired whether deacons had any power to preach publicly in the congregation?—the answer must be

[1] Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 10. [2] Con. Tolet. 4. c. 39. Unum Orarium oportet Levitam gestare in sinistro humero, propter quod orat, id est, prædicat. [3] Socrat, lib. ii. c. 11. [4] Con. Ancyr. c. 2.
[5] Habert. Pontifical. p. 203. Bevereg. Not. in Con. Ancyr. c. 2. Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 99.

same as in the case of baptism: they had power to ıch by license and authority from the bishop, but not ıout it. The author under the name of St. Ambrose[1] ı positively, that deacons did not preach in his time; ıgh he thinks originally all deacons were evangelists, 'hilip and Stephen were. I have showed before, that ıbyters themselves, in many places, were not allowed to ıch in the bishop's presence, but by his special leave; therefore it is much more reasonable to conclude the e of deacons. Blondel[2] and Baronius think that St. ysostom preached those elegant discourses, *De incom-ıensibili Dei Natura, De Anathemate, &c.* while he was a deacon; but others think,[3] more probably, that those ɜ not sermons which he preached in the Church, but discourses that he composed upon other occasions; that his first sermon was that which he preached when was ordained presbyter, now extant in his 4th vol. 53. But if he ever preached while he was deacon, ɜ is no question to be made but that he had the autho- of his bishop, Meletius, for doing it; as Philostorgius[4] Leontius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, permitted us, his deacon, to preach publicly in the Church. rem Syrus perhaps was another such instance; for he never more than a deacon of the Church of Edessa: Photius[5] says he composed several homilies, or ser- s, which were so excellent in their kind, that after his h they were translated into other languages, and al- d to be read in many Churches, immediately after the ing of the Scriptures, as St. Jerom[6] acquaints us. In ɜ places, as in the French Churches, the deacons were orized by canon to read some such homilies in the ɜch instead of a sermon, when the presbyter happened ı sick, and could not preach, as appears from the order

---

nbros. Com. in Eph. 4. Nunc neque Diaconi in populo prædicant, Clerici vel Laici baptizant. [2] Blondel. Apol. p. 57. Baron. 5. p. 532. [3] Cave Hist. Liter. vol. i. p. 253. [4] Philo- lib. iii. c. 17. Διδάσκειν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιτρέπει. [5] Phot. Cod. 196. ἐννέα καὶ τεσσαράκοντα. [6] Hieron. de Scriptor. c. 115.

made in the council of Vaison[1] upon this occasion. But here was necessity and permission too; so that the case of deacons preaching in those ages of the Church, seems to have been (according to the resolution, which Vigilius[2] afterward gave of it) allowable, if authorized by the bishop; but a presumption both against custom and canon, if done without his permission.

SECT. 12.—8. Also to reconcile Penitents in Cases of extreme Necessity.

And so the case stood likewise with deacons, in reference to the power of reconciling penitents, and granting them absolution. This was ordinarily the bishop's sole prerogative, as the supreme minister of the Church, and therefore rarely committed to presbyters, but never to deacons, except in cases of extreme necessity, when neither bishop, nor presbyter, were ready at hand to do it. In this case, deacons were sometimes authorized, as the bishop's special delegates, to give men the solemn imposition of hands, which was the sign of reconciliation. Thus we find it in Cyprian, in the case of those penitents, whom the martyrs, by their letters, recommended to the favour of the Church: "If," says he, "they[3] are seized by any dangerous distemper, they need not expect my return, but may have recourse to any presbyter that is present; or, if a presbyter cannot be found, they may make their confession before a deacon; that so they may receive imposition of hands, and go to the Lord in peace." Here it is observable, that none below a deacon are commissioned to perform this office; nor were the deacons authorized to do it but as the bishop's delegates, and that in cases of extreme necessity, when no presbyter could be found to reconcile the penitent, at the point of death.

---

[1] Con. Valens. l. c. 2. Si Presbyter, aliquâ infirmitate prohibente, per seipsum non potuerit prædicare, Sanctorum Patrum Homiliæ à Diaconibus recitentur. [2] Vigil. Ep. ad Rustic. et Sebastian. Concil. tom. v. p. 554. Adjecistis etiam execrandâ superbiâ, quæ nec leguntur, nec sine sui Pontificis jussione aliquando Ordinis vestri homines præsumpserunt, auctoritatem vobis Prædicationis contra omnem Consuetudinem vel Canones vindicare. [3] Cypr. Ep. 13. al. 18. ad Cler. Si incommodo aliquo et infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, non expectatâ præsentiâ nostrâ, apud Presbyterum quem

And to suspend the Inferior Clergy in some extraordinary Cases.

n the like case, that is, in the case of absolute necessity, eems very probable, that in some of the Greek Churches y had power to suspend the inferior clergy, when need required, and neither bishop, nor presbyter was present do it; which may be collected from those words of the hor of the Constitutions,[1] where he says, "A deacon ommunicates a subdeacon, a reader, a singer, a deaconss, if there be occasion, and the presbyter be not at hand do it. But a subdeacon shall have no power to excomnicate any, either clergy or laity; for subdeacons are y ministers of the deacons." This was a power then nmitted to deacons in extraordinary cases, and a peiar privilege which none of the inferior clergy might oy.

r. 13.—9. Deacons to attend upon their Bishops, and sometimes represent them in General Councils.

It may be reckoned also among their extraordinary oes, that they were sometimes deputed by their bishops to their representatives and proxies in general-councils. eir ordinary office there was only to attend upon their hops, and perform the duties of scribes and disputants, according as they were directed by them; in which tion we commonly find them employed in the ancient ncils. But then there were two things in which they re treated as inferior to presbyters: 1st, in that presters are usually represented as sitting together with their hops, while the deacons stood with all the people. ly, presbyters were sometimes allowed to vote, as has en showed before; but there are no instances, that I ow of, to evidence the same privilege to belong to acons. Only when bishops could not attend in person, ey many times sent their deacons to represent them: and en they sat and voted, not as deacons, but as proxies, in room and place of those that sent them; of which there

que præsentem, vel, si Presbyter repertus non fuerit, et urgere exitus perit, apud Diaconum quoque Exomologesin facere delicti sui possint; ut u eis in pœnitentiâ impositâ veniant ad Dominum cum pace.
nstit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 28. Διάκονος ἀφορίζει τὸν ὑποδιάκονον, &c.

are so many instances in the Acts of the councils, that it is needless to refer the reader to any of them. Yet they that desire to see examples, may consult Christianus Lupus, in his notes upon the seventh canon of the council of Trullo, where he observes some difference in the sitting and voting of deacons in the eastern and western councils. In the eastern councils, if a deacon represented a metropolitan or a patriarch, he sat and subscribed in the place that the metropolitan or patriarch himself would have done, had he been present; but in the western councils it was otherwise; there the deacons voted after all the bishops, and not in the place of those whose proxies they were.

Thus it was in general-councils. But in provincial and consistorial synods, the deacons were sometimes allowed to give their voice, as well as the presbyters in their own name. Of which the reader may see several instances in the Roman councils, under Symmachus and Gregory II. published by Justellus,[1] in his *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici*, and in the fourth tome of the councils, where first the bishops, then the presbyters, and then the deacons, subscribe every one in their own name in particular. And those that are curious about this matter may furnish themselves with many other such examples.

SECT. 14.—10. Deacons empowered to rebuke and correct Men that behaved themselves irregularly in the Church.

There are two things more to be observed concerning the office of deacons in Church-assemblies: first, that as they were the regulators and directors of men's behaviour in divine service; so they had power to rebuke the irregular, and chastise them for any indecent and unseemly deportment. The Constitutions often mention such acts as these belonging to the deacon's office. "If any one be found sitting out of his place, let the deacon rebuke him,[2] and transfer him to his proper station, as the pilot or steersman of the Church." And again, a little after, "Let the deacon[3] overlook and superintend the people, that no one

[1] See before chap. xix. sect. 12. [2] Const. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57. Ἐπιπλησσέσθω ὑπο τοῦ διακόνου, ὡς πρωρέως, &c. [3] Ibid. p. 264. Ὁ διάκονος ἐπισκοπείτω τὸν λαὸν, &c. Confer. lib. viii. c. 11.

talk, or sleep, or laugh, but give ear to the word of God." This is evident also from St. Chrysostom, who, speaking of the irreverent behaviour of some in the Church, bids their neighbours first rebuke them, and if they would not bear it, to call the deacon[1] to do his office towards them. Agreeable to this, Optatus tells us a very remarkable story of Cæcilian, archdeacon of Carthage; "That, observing one Lucilla, a rich woman, commit an indecent act in the time of receiving the holy communion, (for before she received the bread and wine, she was used to kiss the relics of some pretended martyr;) he rebuked her[2] for it by virtue of his office; which she so highly resented, that afterward, when he was chosen bishop, she factiously withdrew herself with some others from his communion, and pretending his ordination to be illegal, she, by her power, got Majorinus ordained against him." And this was one of the principal causes of the schism of the Donatists, as Optatus there observes. It had its rise from the implacable malice of a proud and angry woman, who could never forgive the deacon that rebuked her in the Church. Some may perhaps imagine, that what Cæcilian did was by virtue of a superior office, and that, as archdeacon, he was of an higher order, as now commonly archdeacons are. But I shall show in the next chapter, that anciently archdeacons were always of the order of deacons, and of no other degree: and it appears from what has here been already discoursed, that this act of Cæcilian was not from any peculiar power, that he enjoyed as archdeacon, but from that ordinary power to rebuke offenders, which he had in common with all the other deacons of the Church.

SECT. 15.—11. Deacons anciently performed the Offices of all the Inferior Orders of the Church.

The other thing I would further remark concerning the office of deacons, is this, that before the institution of the inferior orders of the Church (which were not set up in all

[1] Chrys. Hom. 24. in Act. [2] Optat. lib. i. p. 40. Cùm correptionem Archidiaconi Cæciliani ferre non posset, quæ ante spiritalem cibum et potum, os nescio cujus Martyris, si tamen Martyris, libare dicebatur, &c.

Churches at once, nor perhaps in any Church for the two first ages, as shall be showed hereafter) the deacons were employed to perform all such offices, as were, in after ages, committed to those orders; such as the offices of readers, subdeacons, exorcists, or catechists, door-keepers, and the like. Thus Epiphanius[1] observes, that originally all offices of the Church were performed by bishops, presbyters and deacons, and therefore no Church was without a deacon. This was certainly the practice in the time of Ignatius, who never speaks of any order below that of deacons; but without them, he says, no Church was[2] called a Church. So that all the inferior offices must then be performed by deacons. And even in after ages we find that several of the inferior offices were many times put upon the same man; perhaps to avoid the charge of maintaining an overnumerous clergy in lesser Churches. Thus Eusebius tells us, that Romanus, the martyr,[3] was both deacon and exorcist in the Church of Cæsarea. And Procopius, the martyr, had three offices in the Church of Scythopolis; he was at once reader, interpreter, and exorcist; as we learn from the Acts of his martyrdom,[4] published by Valesius. Now both these were martyred in the beginning of the fourth century, in the time of the Diocletion persecution. And we find a whole age after this, if the author under the name of St. Austin[5] may be credited, that except in such great and rich churches as the Church of Rome, where there was a numerous clergy, all the inferior services were still performed by the deacons. In the Greek Church they were always the Πυλωροὶ, or *door keepers*, in the time of the oblation and celebration of the eucharist, as may be seen in the Apostolical[6] Constitutions, where the deacons are commanded to stand at the men's gate, and the sub-deacons at the women's, to see that no one should go out or come in,

---

[1] Epiphan. Hær. 75. Aerian.

[2] Ignat. Ep. ad Tral. n. 3.

[3] Euseb. de Martyr. Palæstin. c. 2.

[4] Acta Procop. ap. Vales. Not. in Euseb. de Martyr. Palæst. c. 1. Ibi Ecclesiæ tria Ministeria præbebat: Unum in Legendi Officio, alterum in Syri Interpretatione Sermonis, et tertium adversus Dæmones manûs impositione consummans.

[5] Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. c. 101. cited before. sect. 4.

[6] Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 11.

during the time of the oblation. These were anciently the deacons' principal employments in the assemblies of the Church.

SECT. 16.—12. Deacons the Bishop's Sub-Almoners.

But besides these we are to take notice of two or three other offices, in which they were commonly employed by the bishop out of the Church. One of these was to be his sub-almoners, to take care of the necessitous, such as orphans, widows, virgins, martyrs in prison, and all the poor and sick who had any title to be maintained out of the public revenues of the Church. The deacons were particularly to inquire into the necessities and wants of all these, and make relation thereof to the bishop, and then distribute to them such charities as they received from him towards their relief and assistance. The archdeacon indeed was, as it were, the bishop's treasurer, but all the deacons were his dispensers, or ministers of the Church's charity to the indigent. Which appears, from several passages in Cyprian,[1] Dionysius[2] of Alexandria, and the author[3] of the Constitutions, who speak indifferently of this office as common to all the deacons. Particularly in the Constitutions the duty of the deacon is thus described, "That he should inform his bishop, when he knows any one to be in distress, and then distribute to their necessities by the directions of the bishop; but to do nothing clancularly without his consent, lest that might seem to accuse him of neglecting the distressed, and so turn to his reproach, and raise a murmuring against him."

SECT. 17.—13. Deacons to inform the Bishop of the Misdemeanours of the People.

Another office of the deacons in this respect was, to make inquiry into the morals and conversation of the people; and such evils as he could not redress himself, by the ordinary power which was intrusted in his hands, of those he was to give information to the bishop, that he, by his supreme

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. 40. al. 52. ad Cornel. [2] Dionys. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. 11. [3] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 31 et 32. lib. iii. c. 19.

authority, might redress them. "Let the deacon," says the book of Constitutions,[1] "refer all things to the bishop, as Christ did to the Father; such things as he is able, let him rectify, by the power which he has from the bishop; but the weightier causes let the bishop judge."

SECT. 18.—Hence Deacons commonly called the Bishop's Eyes, his Mouth, Angels, Prophets, &c.

Upon this account, the deacons were usually styled the bishop's eyes, and his ears, his mouth, his right-hand, and his heart; because by their ministry he overlooked his charge, and by them took cognizance of men's actions, as much as if he himself had seen them with his own eyes, or heard them with his own ears: by them he sent directions and orders to his flock, in which respect they were his mouth and his heart: by them he distributed to the necessities of the indigent, and so they were his right hand. These titles are frequently to be met with in the Constitutions[2] and the author of the Epistle[3] to St. James. And Isidore, of Pelusium, in allusion to them, writing to Lucius,[4] an archdeacon, he tells him in the phrase of the Church, "that he ought to be all eye, forasmuch as deacons were the eyes of the bishop." The author of the Constitutions[5] terms them likewise the bishop's angels and prophets, because they were the persons whom he chiefly employed in messages, either to his own people, or foreign Churches. For then bishops did nothing but by the mouth or hands of one of their clergy.

SECT. 19.—Deacons to be multiplied according to the Necessities of the Church.

For this reason, there being such a multitude and variety of business commonly attending the deacon's office, it was usual to have several deacons in the same Church. In some Churches they were very precise to the number seven, in imitation of the first Church of Jerusalem. The council

---

[1] Const. Apost. lib. ii. c. 44. [2] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 41. lib. iii. c. 19. [3] Clem. Ep. ad Jacob. c. 12. [4] Isidor. lib. i. ep. 29. [5] Const. Apost. lib. ii. c. 30.

of Neocæsarea[1] enacted it into a canon, "that there ought to be but seven deacons in any city, though it was never so great, because this was according to the rule, suggested in the Acts of the Apostles." And the Church of Rome, both before and after this council, seems to have looked upon that as a binding rule also. For it is evident, from the Epistle of Cornelius,[2] written in the middle of the third century, that there were then but seven deacons in the Church of Rome, though there were forty-six presbyters at the same time. And Prudentius intimates that it was so in the time of Sixtus also, Anno 261; for speaking of Laurentius, the deacon, he terms him[3] "the chief of those seven men, who had their station near the altar," meaning the seven deacons of the Church. Nay, in the fourth and fifth centuries the custom there continued the same, as we learn both from Sozomen,[4] and Hilarius Sardus,[5] the Roman deacon, who wrote under the name of St. Ambrose. But Sozomen says, this rule was not observed in other Churches, but the number of deacons was indifferent, as the business of every Church required. And it is certain it was so at Alexandria, and Constantinople: for though one of the writers of the Life of St. Mark,[6] cited by bishop Pearson, says, St. Mark ordained but seven deacons at Alexandria, yet in after ages there were more; for Alexander, in one of his circular letters,[7] names nine deacons, whom he deposed with Arius for their heretical opinions; and it is probable there were several others, who continued orthodox; for in the form of Arius's condemnation, published by Cotelerius,[8] the Catholic deacons of Alexandria and Mareotes are mentioned, as joining with their bishop in condemning him. And for the

---

[1] Con. Neocæsar. c. 15. [2] Cornel. Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. [3] Prudent. Hymn. de S. Laurent. Hic primus è septem viris qui stant ad aram proximi. [4] Sozom. lib. vii. c. 19. Διάκονοι παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις εἰσίτι νῦν ἑ πλείους εἰσὶν ἑπτά. [5] Ambros. Com. in. 1 Tim. iii. p. 995. Nunc autem septem Diaconos esse oportet, aliquantos Presbyteros, ut bini sint per Ecclesias, et unus in Civitate Episcopus. [6] Vit. S. Marci, ap. Pearson. Vind. Ignat. par. 2. c. 11. p. 329. B. Marcus Anianum Alexandriæ ordinavit Episcopum, et tres Presbyteros, et septem Diaconos. [7] Alex. Ep. Encycl. ap. Theodor. lib. i. c. 4. [8] Coteler. Not. in Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 28.

Church of Constantinople, the number of deacons was there so great, that in one of Justinian's Novels[1] we find them limited to an hundred for the service of the great Church and three others only. So that it is evident the number of deacons usually increased with the necessities of the Church, and the Church of Rome was singular in the contrary practice.

SECT. 20.—Of the Age at which Deacons might be ordained.

I speak nothing here of the qualifications required in deacons, because they were generally the same that were required in bishops and presbyters, and will be spoken of hereafter; only in their age there was some difference, which is here to be observed. Bishops and presbyters, as has been noted above, might not ordinarily be ordained before thirty, but deacons were allowed to be ordained at twenty-five, and not before. This is the term fixed both by the civil and canon law, as may be seen in Justinian's[2] Novels, the council of Agde,[3] Carthage, Trullo, and many others. And it was a rule very nicely observed; for though we meet with some bishops that were ordained before this age: yet those (as I have showed before) were never deacons, but ordained immediately bishops from laymen; but among those that were ordained deacons, we scarce meet with an instance of any one that was ordained before the age of twenty-five in all the history of the Church.

SECT. 21.—Of the Respect which Deacons paid to Presbyters, and received from the Inferior Orders.

The last thing which I shall observe of deacons, is the great deference and respect they were obliged to pay to presbyters, as well as to the bishop. It has been proved before, that the presbyters had their thrones in the Church, whereon they sat together with their bishop; but the deacons had no such privilege, but are always represented as

---

[1] Justin. Novel. iii. c. 1. [2] Just. Novel. 123. c. 14. Presbyterum minorem triginta quinque annorum fieri non permittimus. Sed neque Diaconum aut Subdiaconum viginti quinque. [3] Con. Agathens. c. 16. Con. Carth. iii. c. 4. Con. Trull. c. 14. Con. Tolet. iv. c. 19.

standing by them. So the author[1] of the Constitutions and Gregory Nazianzen[2] place them in this order, viz. the bishop sitting on the middle throne, the presbyters sitting on each hand of him, and the deacons standing by. The council of Nice expressly[3] forbids deacons to sit among the presbyters in the Church. And it is evident from St. Jerom,[4] and the author under the name of St. Austin,[5] that though the Roman deacons were grown the most elated of any others, yet they did not presume to sit in the Church. Nay, some Canons go further, and forbid[6] deacons to sit any where in the presence of a presbyter, except by his permission.

The like respect they were to pay to presbyters in several other instances, being obliged to minister to them, as well as to the bishop, in the performance of all divine offices; none of which might be performed by a deacon in the presence of a presbyter, without some special reason for it, as has been noted before. Nay, a deacon was not allowed so much as to bless a common feast, if a presbyter was present at it: as we may see in St. Jerom's[7] Epistle to Evagrius, where he censures the Roman deacons somewhat sharply for presuming to do so.

But then, as the Canons obliged deacons to pay this respect to presbyters; so to distinguish them from the lesser clergy, all the inferior orders were required to pay the same respect to them. The council of Laodicea in the same canon that says, "a deacon shall not sit in the presence of a presbyter without his leave," adds immediately after, "that in like manner the deacon shall be honoured by the subdeacons and all the other clergy." And the council of Agde[8] repeats the canon in the same words. I shall here

---

[1] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57. [2] Greg. Naz. Somn. de Eccles. Anastas. [3] Con. Nic. c. 18. [4] Hieron. Ep. 85, ad Evagr. In Ecclesiâ Romæ Presbyteri sedent, et stant Diaconi, [5] Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. c. 101. Quanquam Romanæ Ecclesiæ Diaconi modicè inverecundiores videantur, sedendi tamen dignitatem in Ecclesiâ non præsumunt. [6] Con. Laodic. c. 20. Carth. 4. c. 39.

[7] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Licèt, increbrescentibus vitiis, inter Presbyteros, absente Episcopo, sedere Diaconum viderim: et in domesticis conviviis, Benedictiones Presbyteris dare. (al. Benedictiones coram Presbyteris dare.)

[8] Con. Agathens. c. 65. Non oportet Diaconum sedere, præsente Presbytero,

also remind the reader of what I have observed before, that deacons in some Churches had power to censure the inferior clergy in the absence of the presbyters. St. Jerom[1] seems also to say, " that their revenues were rather greater than those of the presbyters, which made them sometimes troublesome and assuming. Beside all this the order of deacons was of great repute, because the archdeacon was always then one of this order, and he was commonly a man of great interest and authority in the Church; of whose powers and privileges because it is necessary to discourse a little more particularly, I shall treat distinctly of them in the following chapter.

CHAP. XXI.

Of Archdeacons.

SECT. 1.—Archdeacons anciently of the same Order with Deacons.

THOUGH archdeacons in these last ages of the Church have usually been of the order of presbyters, yet anciently they were no more than deacons: which appears evidently from those writers, who give us the first account of them. St. Jerom[2] says, " the archdeacon was chosen out of the deacons, and was the principal deacon in every Church, as the archpresbyter was the principal presbyter; and that there was but one of each in every Church." Optatus calls Cæcilian[3] " archdeacon of Carthage;" yet he was never more than a deacon, till he was ordained bishop, as has been showed before: and that made Cæcilian himself say, " that if he was not rightly ordained bishop, as the Dona-

---

sed ex jussione Presbyteri sedeat. Similiter autem honorificetur Diaconus à Ministris inferioribus et omnibus Clericis. [1] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Presbyter noverit se Lucris minorem, Sacerdotio esse majorem. Id. Com. in Ezek. c. 48. Ultra Sacerdotes, hoc est, Presbyteros intumescunt: et Dignitatem non merito sed divitiis æstimant. [2] Hieron. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Aut Diaconi eligant de se, quem industrium noverint, et Archidiaconum vocent. Id. Ep. 4. ad Rustic. Singuli Ecclesiarum Episcopi, singuli Archipresbyteri, singuli Archidiaconi. [3] Optat. lib. i. p. 40. Cùm correptionem Archidiaconi Cœciliani ferre non posset, etc.

pretended, he[1] was to be treated only as a deacon." It tain also St. Laurence, archdeacon of Rome, was no than the chief of the deacons, or the principal[2] man of even, who stood and waited at the altar, as Prudentius s it. From these testimonies it is very plain, that in times the archdeacon was always one of the order of ons.

Sect. 2.—Elected by the Bishop, and not made by Seniority.

t how the archdeacon came by his honour, and after manner he was invested with his office, is a matter of dispute among learned men. Salmasius[3] and some s are of opinion, that originally he was no more than enior deacon, though they own that in process of time ffice became elective. Habertus[4] thinks it was always ve, and that it was at the bishop's liberty and discre- o nominate which of the deacons he thought fit to the . That it was so in the case of Athanasius, seems y evident from what Theodoret[5] says of him, "that gh he was very young, yet he was made chief of the of deacons; for this implies, as Valesius there ob- s, "that he was chosen by the bishop, and preferred e his seniors." St. Jerom, in the forecited passage, ainly asserts that the office went not by seniority, but ion; only he seems to put the power of electing in the ons: but if they had any hand in it, it must be under- to be under the direction of the bishop, who is re- d by some Canons to choose his own archdeacon, and arily to give preference to the senior, if he was duly fied; but if not, to make choice of any other, whom he ght most fit to discharge the offices of the Church,[6] he trust that was reposed in him.

---

tat. Ibid. p. 41. Iterum à Cæciliano mandatum est, ut si Felix in se, li arbitrabantur, nihil contulisset, ipsi tanquam adhuc Diaconum ordi- Cæcilianum. [2] Prudent. Hymn. de S. Steph. Hic Primus è sep- ris, qui stant ad aram proximi. [3] Salmas. de Primat. p. 8. Thesaur. Eccl. tom. i. p. 531. [4] Habert. Pontifical. obs. 6. [5] Theod. lib. i. c. 26. Νέος μὲν ὢν τὴν ἡλικίαν, τῇ χορῇ δὲ κόνων ἡγούμενος. [6] Con. Agathens. c. 23. Si Officium Archi- atûs, propter simpliciorem naturam implere aut expedire nequiverit, i sui nomen teneat, et ordinationi Ecclesiæ, quem Episcopus elegerit, natur.

Sect. 3.—Commonly Persons of such Interest in the Church, that they were chosen the Bishop's Successors.

The office of the archdeacon was always a place of great honour and reputation: for he was the bishop's constant attendant and assistant; and next to the bishop the eyes of whole Church were fixed upon him. By which means he commonly gained such an interest, as to get himself chosen the bishop's successor before the presbyters; of which it were easy to give several instances, as Athanasius, Cæcilian, and many others. And this, I presume, was the reason why St. Jerom says, "that an archdeacon thought himself injured,[1] if he was ordained a presbyter;" probably, because he thereby lost his interest in the Church, and was disappointed of his preferment. We might certainly conclude it was thus in the Church of Rome, if what Eulogius, a Greek writer in Photius, says, might be depended on as true: "That it was a law[2] at Rome to choose the archdeacon the bishop's successor; and that, therefore, Cornelius ordained Novatian presbyter, to deprive him of the privilege and hopes of succeeding." But I confess there is no small reason to question the truth of this relation, both because we read of no such law in any writer of the Latin Church; and because this author palpably mistakes, in saying, that Cornelius ordained Novatian presbyter, who was presbyter long before; and probably never was archdeacon, nor deacon, but ordained presbyter immediately from a layman, as may be collected from the letters of Cyprian[3] and Cornelius[4] which tacitly reflect upon him for it. Yet, if by law Eulogius meant no more than custom, perhaps it might be customary at Rome, as at some other places, to make the archdeacons the bishop's successors; their power and privileges, as I observed commonly gaining them a considerable interest both among the clergy and the people.

---

[1] Hieron. Com. in Ezek. c. 48. Certè qui Primus fuerit Ministrorum, qui per singula concionatur in populos, et à Pontificis latere non recedit, injuriam putat, si Presbyter ordinetur. [2] Eulog. ap. Phot. Cod. 182. Τὸν ἀρχιδιάκονον ἐνενόμιτο διάδοχον τῦ ἀρχιερατευοντος καθίτασθαι [3] Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 103. [4] Cornel. Ep. ad Fabian. ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43.

CT. 4.—The Offices of the Archdeacon. 1. To attend the Bishop at the Altar, &c.

As to the archdeacon's office, he was always the bishop's mmediate minister and attendant; "*A latere Pontificis non cessit,*" to use St. Jerom's phrase, "*he was always by his de, ready to assist him:*" particularly at the altar, when ie bishop ministered, he performed the usual offices of a eacon, that have been mentioned in the last chapter. The ithor of the Constitutions calls him, "Ὁ παρεστὼς τῷ ρχιερεῖ, *the deacon that stood by the bishop,*" and proaimed, when the communion-service began, "Let no one[1] pproach in wrath against his brother; let no one oome in ypocrisy." To him it belonged to minister the cup to the eople, when the bishop celebrated the eucharist, and had ministered the bread before him, as we learn from the ccount which St. Ambrose[2] gives of Laurentius, archdeacon f Rome. It was his business, also, as the bishop's substiite, to order all things relating to the inferior clergy, and ieir ministrations and services in the Church: as what eacon should read the Gospel, who should bid the prayers, hich of them should keep the doors, which walk about ie Church to observe the behaviour of the people; which f the readers, acolythists, subdeacons, should perform their rvice at such a time, or in what post and station: for these iings were not precisely determined, but at the bishop's berty to ordain and appoint them; which he commonly id by his archdeacon, whose orders and directions, therere, are sometimes called *Ordinationes*, and *Ordinatio*[3] *Ecclesiæ*, in some of the ancient councils; whence I presume ame the name, ordinary, which is a title given to archdeaons in after ages.

SECT. 5.—2. To assist him in managing the Church's Revenues.

He assisted the bishop in managing and dispensing he Church's revenues, having the chief care of the poor, rphans, widows, &c. under the bishop, whose portions

[1] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57. [2] Ambros. de Offic. lib. i. c. 41. [3] Vid. Con. Agathens. c. 23. Isidor. Hispal. Ep. ad Ludifred. ap. Gratian. Dist. 25. c. 1.

were assigned by him, and sent by the hands of the other deacons that were under him. The fourth council[1] of Carthage makes mention of this part of his office, when it requires the bishop "not to concern himself personally in the care and government of the widows, orphans, and strangers, but to commit this to his archpresbyter or archdeacon." Upon this account Prudentius,[2] describing the offices of St. Laurence, whom he makes to be archdeacon of Rome, among other things assigns him the keys of the Church's treasure, and the care of dispensing the oblations of the people. And for the same reason both he and St. Ambrose,[3] and all other writers of his passion, bring in the heathen persecutor, demanding of him those treasures which he had in his keeping; which he promising to do, in a short time after, brought before him the poor, the lame, the blind, the infirm; telling him, "those were the riches which he had in his custody, for on them he had expended the Church's treasure." St. Austin says this was his office, as he was archdeacon of the Church. Paulinus,[4] therefore, calls the archdeacon, "*Arcæ custodem, the keeper of the chest;*" because, though the other deacons were the dispensers and conveyors, yet he was the chief manager and director of them, and from him they took their orders, as from the guardian of the Church's treasure. It was upon this account that the Donatists charged Cæcilian, among other things, "that he had prohibited the deacons from carrying any provision[5] to the martyrs in prison;" which objection must be grounded upon this, that he was obliged by his office, as he was archdeacon, to see that the martyrs were

[1] Con. Carth. iv. c. 17. Ut Episcopus gubernationem Viduarum, Pupillorum, ac Peregrinorum, non per seipsum, sed per Archipresbyterum, aut per Archidiaconum agat. [2] Prudent. Hymn. de Sto. Laur. Levita sublimis gradu, et cæteris præstantior, claustris sacrorum præerat; Cœlestis arcanum Domûs fidis gubernans clavibus, votasque dispensans opes.
[3] Ambros. de Offic. lib. ii. c. 28. Aug. Serm. 111. de Diversis. Sanctus Laurentius Archidiaconus fuit: Opes Ecclesiæ ab illo Persecutore quærebantur. Id. de Divers. Ser. 123. [4] Paulin. de Mirac. S. Martin. lib. iv. Bibl. Patr. tom. viii. p. 865.

Protinus adstanti Diacono, quem more priorum
Antistes Sanctæ Custodem legerat Arcæ,
Imperat, &c.

[5] Aug. Brevic. Collat. iii. c. 14.

ovided of sustenance; which they pretended he had not ly neglected, but abused his authority, in forbidding those at were under his command, to minister unto them.

SECT. 6.—3. In Preaching.

Another part of his office was to assist the bishop in eaching. For as any deacon was authorized to preach by e bishop's leave, so the archdeacon being the most emi-nt of the deacons, was more frequently pitched upon to charge this office; if we may so understand those words St. Jerom, which have been cited before in the third sec-n, "*Primus Ministrorum per singula concionatur in pulos,—the chief minister or archdeacon, is many times, d in many places employed in preaching to the people.*" r the word, *singula*, may relate both to times and places. t if any one thinks, that *concionari* here signifies no re than *prædicare* and κηρύσσειν, *doing the office of an ly cryer in the assembly*, I shall not contend about it; t only say, that St. Jerom, speaking of something that n made the archdeacons popular, seems rather to mean e office of preaching, than any other.

SECT. 7.—4. In Ordaining the Inferior Clergy.

The archdeacon usually bore a part with the bishop the ordinations of the inferior clergy, subdeacons, acoly-sts, &c. His office in this matter is particularly de-ibed in several canons[1] of the fourth council of Car-ge, which relate the manner how the inferior clergy re to be ordained, viz. not by imposition of hands, which longed only to the superior orders, but by receiving ne vessels or utensils of the Church, partly from the nds of the bishop, and partly from the hands of the hdeacon. As to give only one instance in the ordination an acolythist, the canon says, "The bishop was to inform n what his duty was; and then the archdeacon was to give n a taper into his hand, that he might know that he was pointed to light the candles of the Church."

[1] Con. Carth. iv. c. 5, 6, 9.

SECT. 8.—5. The Archdeacon had Power to censure Deacons and the Inferior Clergy, but not Presbyters.

The archdeacon was invested also with a power of censuring the other deacons, and all the inferior clergy of the Church. That it was so, at least in some Churches, is very evident from a passage in the Acts of the council of Chalcedon, where Ibas, bishop of Edessa, speaking of Maras, one of the deacons of his Church, says, "he was not excommunicated by himself, but by his archdeacon, who,[1] for a crime committed against a presbyter, suspended him from the communion."

But whether the archdeacon had any power over presbyters, is a matter of dispute among learned men: Salmasius,[2] and the learned Suicerus[3] after him, scruple not to assert, "that even the archpresbyter himself in the Roman Church was subject to him." Cujacius, and some others, who are cited by Baluzius,[4] go one step further, and say it was so in all Churches. Yet there is not the least footstep of any such power to be met with in any ancient writer or council; but the original of all the mistake is owing to a corruption in Gratian's Decree, and Gregory the Ninth's Decretals, who cite the words alleged[5] in the margin, the one as from Isidore of Sevil, and the other from the council of Toledo, pretending that the archpresbyter is to be subject to the archdeacon: when yet, as both Baluzius and the Roman correctors confess, there are no such words to be found in Isidore's Epistle; nor will Garsias Loaisa own them to be the genuine decree of any council of Toledo. So that the whole credit of this matter rests upon Gratian and the compilers of the Decretals, whose authority is of little esteem in things relating to antiquity, when there is no better proof than their bare assertion. Yet I shall not deny, but that in Gratian's time it might be as he represents it; for

---

[1] Con. Chalced. Act. x. p. 653. Ἀκοινώνητός ἐστι τῷ ἰδίῳ Ἀρχιδιακόνῳ, &c. [2] Salmas. de Primat. c. i. p. 9. [3] Suicer. Thesaur. tom. i. p. 583. [4] Baluz. Not. ad Gratian. Dist. xxv. c. 1. p. 455. [5] Grat. Dist. xxv. c. 1. ex Epist. Isidor. Hispal. ad Ludifred. Archipresbyter verò se esse sub Archidiacono, ejusque præceptis, sicut Episcopi sui, scist obed're. In Gregory's Decretal, lib. i. tit. 24. De Officio Archipresb. c. 1. The same words are cited ex Concilio Toletano.

probably by this time the archdeacons were chosen out of the order of presbyters; though when first they began to be so, is not very easy to determine. Only we are certain that some centuries before the time of Gratian the custom was altered. For archdeacons, in the ninth century, were some of them at least of the order of presbyters; as appears from Hincmar's Capitula[1] directed to Guntharius and Odelhardus, two of his archdeacons, whom he styles, presbyter-archdeacons. And there is reason enough to think it was so in the time of Gratian: the archdeacons were then generally of the order of presbyters, as they have been ever since; which makes it no wonder that in Gratian's time they should have power over the *Archipresbyteri*, which, in the language of that age, often signifies no more than rural deans, over which the archdeacons have usually power at this day. But by this the reader may judge how little such writers are to be depended on, who take their estimate of former ages from the practice of their own, and reckon every thing ancient, that is agreeable to the rules and customs of the times they live in.

SECT. 9.—Of the Name Ἀπαντιτὴς, *Circumlustrator*, and whether Archdeacons had any Power over the whole Diocese.

But to return to the archdeacons of the primitive Church. There is one thing more may admit of some dispute,—whether the archdeacon's power anciently extended over the whole diocese, or was confined to the city or mother Church? In the middle ages of the Church there is no question but they had power over the whole diocese; for Isidorus Hispalensis, who lived in the beginning of the seventh century, in the account which he gives of the archdeacon's office, says, "the parochial clergy were under his care, (that is, the deacons and inferior clergy:) and that it belonged to him[2] to order mat-

[1] Hincmar. Capitula Archidiaconibus Presbyteris data. Con. tom. viii. p. 591. [2] Isidor. Ep. ad Ludifred. et ap. Gratian. Dist. xxv. c. 1. Solicitudo quoque Parochitanorum (al. Parochiarum) et ordinatio, et jurgia ad ejus pertinent curam: Pro reparandis Diœcesanis Basilicis i, se suggerit Sacerdoti: Ipse inquirit Parochias cum jussione Episcopi, et Ornamenta, vel res Basilicarum Parochitanorum (al. Parochiarum) et Libertatum Ecclesiasticarum Episcopo idem refert.

ters, and end controversies among them; to give the bishop an account what Churches stood in need of repairing; to make inquiry by the bishop's order into the state of every parish, and see what condition the ornaments and goods of the Church were in, and whether the ecclesiastical liberties were maintained." Habertus thinks[1] the archdeacons were invested with the same power some ages before, and for proof cites a passage out of the council of Chalcedon, where in an instrument[2] presented by the presbyters of Edessa against Ibas, their bishop, one Abramius, a deacon of that Church, in all the Latin translations is called *Diaconus Apantita*, which Habertus takes to be *a general inspector* of the Church. But there are two evident reasons against this, which it is a wonder so observing a person as Habertus should not see: 1st. That Abramius was not an archdeacon, but only a private deacon of the Church; for in the same place there is mention made of another archdeacon, who, when Ibas was about to have had Abramius ordained bishop of Batena, interposed and hindered him from doing it, because he had been censured for the practice of magic, and never given any satisfaction to the Church. And though it is said, that Ibas took occasion to remove that archdeacon from his office, yet it is not once intimated that he put Abramius in his room; which if he had done, it would doubtless have been made another article of accusation against him before the council. 2dly. The original Greek in Labbe's edition is not Διάκονος ἀπαντιτὴς, as Habertus reads it, but only "Διάκονος ἀπ' ἀυτῆς τῆς ἡμετέρης ἐκκλησίας, *a deacon of that our Church of Edessa:*" and though Ἀπαντιτὴς be put into the margin, yet it is not owned to be any various reading, but only the editor's conjecture; which I think is not sufficient to build such an assertion upon, when no other proof or authority is pretended. Therefore I determine nothing concerning this power of the archdeacons in ancient times, but leave it to further inquiry, and the determination of every judicious reader.

---

[1] Habert. in Pontifical. par. 9. obser. 6. [2] Con. Chalced. Act. x. p. 650.

Sect. 10.—Of the Name *Cor-Episcopi*, why given to Archdeacons.

ılesius takes notice of another name, which he thinks sometimes given to the archdeacons, that is the name *·Episcopi*; for which he cites the words of one Joannes as[1] in a book written about the translation of the relicks ſt. Glodesindis. This at first may look like a corruption ıe name *Chorepiscopus*, because in the latter ages the er of the ancient *Chorepiscopi* dwindled into that of the deacons; but when it is considered, that all the ›ons anciently were called the bishop's eyes, and his ears, mouth, and his heart, as has been noted in the last ›ter, sect. 18. it will appear very probable that the arch-›on should be peculiarly dignified with those titles; therefore be called *Cor-Episcopi, the bishop's heart,* ıuse he was used to signify his mind and will to the ple: as he is called *Oculus Episcopi*, not only in ancient ıors[2] but in the Decretals,[3] and the council of Trent,[4] ause he was *the bishop's eye* to inspect the diocese under

:. 11.—The Opinions of Learned Men concerning the first Original of the Name and Office of Arch-deacon.

ome may perhaps be desirous to know further the first and original of the name and office of archdeacons in Church; but this is a matter involved in so great curity, that it cannot easily be determined. Habertus some others[5] of the Roman Communion, reckon this ce as ancient as that of deacons themselves, deriving h from apostolical constitution, and making Stephen the t archdeacon of the Church. But others with greater ›on,[6] deduce it only from the third century, and leave it ı matter under debate and inquiry, whether there were such thing as the archdeacon's office in the time of nelius, bishop of Rome, which was in the middle of the

---

Joh. Abbas ap. Vales. Not. in Theodorit. lib. i. c. 26. Ad hoc inspicium Sacrorum Ministros cum Archidiacono majore, quem Cor-Episcopi int, Pontifex direxit. [2] Isidor. Pelus. lib. i. ep. 29.
eretal. lib. i. tit. xxiii. c. 7. [4] Con. Trid. Sess. xxiv. cap. 12. Reform. [5] Habert. Not. in Pontifical. p. 207. Baron. an. 34. 35. [6] Bp. Fell. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 49. ad Cornel.

third century. This is certain, that Cornelius in his Epistle to Fabius, where he gives a catalogue[1] of the Roman clergy, though he speaks of deacons, subdeacons, acolythists, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, makes no particular mention of the archdeacon; nor does Cyprian ever so much as once use the name. Yet before the end of this century, Cæcilian is supposed to have had the title, as well as the office, of archdeacon of Carthage, because Optatus calls him so; and the name often occurs in St. Jerom and other writers of the fourth age, in which St. Jerom lived. Baronius indeed urges St. Austin's authority, to prove that Stephen was properly an archdeacon; for he says, St. Austin calls him *Primicerius diaconorum.* But he that will look into St. Austin, will quickly find his mistake; for his words are not *Primicerius diaconorum,* but *Primicerius*[2] *martyrum, the protomartyr,* as we commonly call him, because he was the first that suffered for the name of Christ. And hence the reader may observe by the way, that the words *primicerius* and *primus,* do not always denote principality or priority of power and jurisdiction, but only priority of time or precedency of honour and digntiy, in respect of place, or outward order. In which sense the same St. Austin[3] says, in another place, "that Stephen is named first among the deacons, as Peter was among the Apostles;" Which is a primacy that may be allowed to them both, without any pretence of jurisdiction. Habertus urges further the authority of the Greek Menologion, which gives Stephen the title of archdeacon: but such books are not sufficient evidence, being they are of a modern date, and speak of ancient things in the language and phrase of their own times; for which reason they are not much to be depended on, except when they are backed with the concurrent testimony of some ancient authors, of which there are none in this case to yield any collateral evidence to this assertion. Yet, on the other hand, the opinion of Salmasius is equally to be

---

[1] Cornel. Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. [2] Aug. Ser. i. de Sanctis. tom. x. Hodiè celebramus Natalem, quo Primicerius Martyrum migravit ex mundo. [3] Aug. Ser. 94 de Diversis. Inter Diaconos illos nominatus Primus, sicut inter Apostolos Petrus.

iscarded, who[1] asserts that the office of archdeacon was not n the Church in the time of St. Jerom, though St. Jerom[2] imself says, in most express words, "that the custom then as to have one bishop, one archpresbyter, one archdeacon, n every Church." But this is the usual way of that author n his book *De Primatu* to advance paradoxes of his own ancy for ancient history, and lay down positive assertions upon the most slender conjectures; yea, many times against he plainest evidence of primitive records, as in the case efore us, and many others which I have had occassion to ake notice of in this discourse. It were to be wished, that hat author, who wrote upon a useful design, had been a ittle more accurate in his accounts of the state of the clergy of the primitive Church; and whilst he was demolishing the Pope's supremacy, had not confusedly treated of some other orders and offices, which were of greater antiquity in the Church.

CHAP. XXII.

Of Deaconesses.

SECT. 1.—The ancient Name of Deaconesses, Διάκονοι, Πρεσβύτιδες, *Viduæ*, *Ministræ*.

HAVING spoken of deacons and archdeacons, it remains that I say something in this place of deaconesses, because their office and service was of great use in the primitive Church. There is some mention made of them in Scripture, by which it appears, that their office was as ancient as the apostolical age. St. Paul calls Phœbe, "a servant of the Church of Cenchrea." Rom. xvi. 1. The original word is Διάκονος, *a deaconess*, answerable to the Latin word *Ministra*, which is the name that is given them in Pliny's Epistle,[3] which speaks about the Christians. Tertullian[4] and

[1] Salmas. de Primat. c. i. p. 8. [2] Hieron. Ep. 4. ad Rustic. cited efor. sect. 1. [3] Plin. Lib. x. Ep. 97. Quò magis necessarium credidi, x duabus ancillis, quæ Ministræ dicebantur, quid esset veri et per tormenta uærere. [4] Tertul. Lib. i. ad Uxor. c. 7. Id. de Veland. Virg. c. 9. Epiph. Hær. 79. n. 4. Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 13.

some others call them *Viduæ, widows*, and their office *Viduatus*, because they were commonly chosen out of the widows of the Church. For the same reason, Epiphanius,[1] and the council of Laodicea,[2] call them Πρεσβύτιδες, *elderly widows*, because none but such were ordinarily taken into this office.

SECT. 2.—Deaconesses to be Widows by some Laws.

For, indeed, by some ancient laws, these four qualifications were required in every one that was to be taken into this order. 1st. That she should be a widow. 2dly. That she should be a widow that had borne children. 3dly. A widow that was but once married. 4thly. One of a considerable age, forty, fifty, or sixty years old. Though all these rules admitted of exceptions. In Tertullian's time the deaconesses were so commonly chosen out of the widows, that when a certain young virgin was made a deaconess, he speaks of it[3] "as a miracle or monstrous thing in the Church." Yet some learned men are of opinion, that virgins were sometimes made deaconesses even in the time of Ignatius; because Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Church of Smyrna,[4] salutes "the virgins that were called widows," that is, deaconesses, as Cotelerius and Vossius truly expound it; for virgins could not be called widows congruously in any other sense. Some suspect that the word, virgins, is a corruption crept into the text: but there is no reason for this conjecture; for Ignatius is not the only author that speaks of virgin-deaconesses. Epiphanius[5] says, in his time "they were some virgins, and some widows that had been but once married." The author of the Constitutions[6] says the same, "That the deaconess was either to be a chaste virgin, or a widow that had been the wife of one

[1] Epiphan. Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 4. [2] Con. Laodic. c. 11.
[3] Tertul. de Veland. Virg. c. 9. Scio alicubi Virginem in Viduatu ab annis nondum viginti collocatam; cui si quid refrigerii debuerat Episcopus, aliter utique, salvo respectu disciplinæ, præstare potuisset, ne tale nunc miraculum, ne dixerim monstrum, in Ecclesiâ denotaretur. [4] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 13. Ἀσπάζομαι τὰς παρθένους τὰς λεγομένας χήρας. Coteler. in Loc. Viduæ vocabantur, quia in Gradu Viduali, seu Diaconico erant constitutæ.
[5] Epiph. Expos. Fid. n. 21. Ἡ χηρεύσασαι ἀπὸ μονογαμίας, ἢ ἀειπάρθενοι ὑσαι. [6] Const. Apost. lib. vi. c. 17.

man." And one of Justinian's Novels[1] enacted it into a law, that the deaconesses should be chosen out of one of these orders. Accordingly we find, in the practice of the Church, virgins as well as widows admitted to this office. Gregory Nyssen[2] says, his own sister, Macrina, who was a virgin, was a deaconess; and so was Lampadia, another virgin. And Sozomen[3] relates how that Chrysostom would have ordained Nicarete, a famous virgin, to this office; but she refused it for the love she had to a private and philosophic life.

SECT. 3.—And such Widows as had Children.

Yet by some laws they were required not only to be widows, but such widows as had children also. Tertullian[4] seems to intimate that this was the custom of the age he lived in, to put none into this office but "such as were mothers, and had had the education of children, in the training up of whom they had learnt to be tender and compassionate in their affections, and so were qualified to assist others, both by their counsel and comfort." Sozomen also mentions a law[5] made by Theodosius to this purpose, "That no women should be admitted to the office except they had children and were above sixty years old, according to the express rule of St. Paul." The law is still extant in the Theodosian Code,[6] in the same words as Sozomen cites; but he speaks of it as a new law, that was then made upon a particular occasion, by reason of some scandal that had happened in the Church; which is a plain intimation that, from the time of Tertullian to the making of this law, the Church had varied in her practice.

---

[1] Just. Novel. vi. c. 6. Aut Virgines constitutas, aut unius viri quæ fuerant uxores. [2] Nyssen. Vit. Macrin. tom. ii. p. 181 et 197.
[3] Sozom. lib. viii. c. 23. [4] Tertul. de Veland. Virg. c. 9. Ad quam sedem præter annos sexaginta non tantùm univiræ, id est nuptæ, aliquando eliguntur, sed et matres, et quidem educatrices filiorum: scilicet ut experimentis omnium affectuum structæ, facilè nôrint cæteras et consilio et solatio juvare. [5] Sozom. lib. vii. c. 17. Εἰ μὴ παῖδας ἔχοιεν. [6] Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. Leg. 27. Nulla nisi emensis sexaginta annis, cui votiva domi proles sit, secundùm præceptum Apostoli ad Diaconissarum consortium transferatur.

SECT. 4.—Not to be ordained under Sixty Years of Age, by the most ancient Canons.

And so she had likewise with respect to the age of deaconesses. For though the fore-mentioned law of Theodosius require them to be sixty years of age complete; and Tertullian[1] and St. Basil[2] speak of the same age. Yet Justinian, in one of his Novels,[3] requires but fifty; and in another[4] but forty, which is all that was insisted on before by the great council of Chalcedon,[5] whose words are, "No woman shall be ordained a deaconess before she is forty years old." And it is probable, in some cases, that term was not strictly required; for Sozomen[6] says, "Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, ordained Olympias a deaconess, though she was but a young widow, because she was a person of extraordinary virtue." By which we may judge, that as the Church varied in her rule about this matter, so bishops took a liberty to ordain deaconesses at what age they thought fit, provided they could be assured of their probity and virtue.

SECT. 5.—To be such as had been only the Wives of one Man.

But there was another qualification, which they were more strict in exacting, which was, "that the deaconesses should be such widows as had been only the wives of one man," according to the Apostle's prescription, 1 Tim. v. 9. which rule they generally understood as a prohibition of electing any to be deaconesses who had been twice married, though lawfully and successively, to two husbands, one after another. In this sense Tertullian[7] says, "the Apostle requires them to be *Univiræ, the wives of one man,*" which Epiphanius[8] calls "Χηρεύσασαι ἀπο μονογαμίας, *widows*

[1] Tertul. ibid. [2] Basil. Ep. Canonic. c. 24. [3] Just. Novel. vi. c. 6. Super mediam constitutas ætatem, et circa quinquaginta annos.
[4] Novel. cxxiii. c. 13. Diaconissa in sanctâ Ecclesiâ non ordinatur, quæ minor quadraginta annis sit. [5] Con. Chalced. c. 14. al. 15. Διάκονον μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι γυναῖκα πρὸ ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα. Vid. Con. Trull. c. 14 et 40. [6] Sozom. lib. viii. c. 9. Καίπερ νέαν χήραν γενομένην διάκονον ἐχειροτόνησε. [7] Tertul. ad Uxor. lib. i. c. 7. Viduam allegi in ordinationem nisi univiram non concedit. It. de Veland. Virg. c. 9.
[8] Epiph. Exp. Fid. n. 21.

that have been but once married." So the author of the Constitutions, and Justinian's Novels,[1] which have been cited before.

But Theodoret gives a different sense of the Apostle's words; for he supposes the Apostle not to forbid the choosing of widows that had been twice married, but only such[2] as had married again after they had divorced themselves from a former husband; which was such a scandalous act, as justly excluded them from the Church's service. And this sense is embraced, as the most probable and rational, by the learned Justellus,[3] Dr. Hammond,[4] Suicerus,[5] and several others; of which I shall have occasion to give a further account, when I come to speak of that apostolical rule as it concerned all the clergy. Thus much will suffice to be spoken at present concerning the qualifications of deaconesses before they were ordained.

SECT. 6.—Whether Deaconesses were anciently ordained by Imposition of Hands.

The next inquiry is concerning their ordination itself,—whether it was always performed by imposition of hands? And here learned men are very much divided in their sentiments. Baronius[6] thinks they had no imposition of hands at the time of the council of Nice; and he grounds his assertion upon one of the canons of that council; which, as he expounds it, denies that deaconesses were ordained by imposition of hands, and therefore makes no other account of them than as mere lay-persons. Valesius[7] gives the same exposition of the canon; though he owns, that Balsamon and Zonaras, the ancient expositors, were of a contrary judgment, *viz.* "That the canon speaks not of the deaconesses of the Church, but of such as returned to the Catholic Church from the Paulianists or Samosatenian heretics, among whom they had received no imposition of hands, and therefore were to be treated as mere laics." And in

---

[1] Justin. Novel. vi. c. 6. Constit. Apost. lib. vi. c. 17. [2] Theod. Com. in 1 Tim. 5. 9. [3] Justel. Not. ad Can. 1. Con. Laodic.
[4] Ham. Annot. on 1 Tim. 3. 2. [5] Suicer. Thesaur. tom. i. p. 899.
[6] Baron. an. 44. n. 283. It Cabassut. Notit. Concil. c. 56. p. 342. [7] Vales. Not. in. Sozomen. lib. viii. c. 9.

this sense Suicerus,[1] and Albaspiny,[2] Christianus Lupus, Fabrotus, and other modern critics and expositors of the canon explain it also. To make the reader himself judge in the matter, I must here recite the words of the canon, which are these: "Concerning the Paulianists which return to the Catholic Church, it is decreed, that they shall be, by all means, re-baptized; and if any of them were heretofore reckoned among the clergy, if they appear to be blameless, and without rebuke, let them be first baptized, and then ordained by the bishop of the Catholic Church: but if, upon examination, they be found unfit, let them be deposed. The same rule shall be observed concerning deaconesses, and all others who are reckoned among their clergy. And we particularly take notice[3] of deaconesses, which appear in that habit or dignity, that having never had any imposition of hands, they are to be reckoned only among the laity." These last words about deaconesses seem to refer to what goes before; and then they must be interpreted of deaconesses among the Paulianists, who took upon them the habit of deaconesses without any consecration. Or, if we understand them as spoken of deaconesses already in the Church, they may mean that there were some deaconesses which had crept into the office without imposition of hands, and such the council accounts no more than lay-persons. That which will incline a man to interpret this canon to some such sense as this, is, that all other councils and writers speak of ordaining deaconesses by imposition of hands. Valesius himsslf owns that it was so in the time of the council of Chalcedon; for in one of the canons of that council[4] their ordination is expressly called both Χειροτονία and Χειροθεσία, *ordination by imposition of hands.* And the author of the Constitutions,[5] speaking of their ordination, requires the bishop to use imposition of hands,

---

[1] Suicer. Thesaur. tom. i. p. 867. [2] Albasp. Not. in Can. 19. Con. Nicen. Lupus. tom. i. Schol. in eund. Con. Fabrot. Not. ad Balsamon Collect. Constitut. p. 1417. [3] Con. Nic. c. 19. Ἐμνήσθημεν δὲ τῶν διακονισσῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ σχήματι ἐξεταθεισῶν, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ χειροθεσίαν τινὰ ἔχουσιν, ὥστε ἐξ ἁπαντος εν τοῖς λαϊκοῖς αὐτὰς ἐξετάζεσθαι. [4] Con. Chalced. c. 15. [5] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 19. Ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, ἐπιθήσεις αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας &c.

with a form of prayer, which is there recited. And thus it was, both in the Greek and Latin Church, so long as the order itself continued to be in use. The council of Trullo, Anno 692, speaks of their ordination in two canons,[1] under the name of Χειροτονία: and Sozomen[2] uses the same word in speaking of the ordination of Olympias. And though there be not so many examples of this practice to be met with in the Latin Church, because the order was there much sooner laid aside, yet Cotelerius[3] has furnished us with some out of Fortunatus, and the council of Worms, both which expressly say, the ordination of deaconesses was performed by imposition of hands. In the council of Worms, the 15th canon of the council of Chalcedon is repeated. And Fortunatus's words are, "*Manu superposita*[4] *consecravit diaconam*," speaking of one whom Medardus, the bishop, consecrated a deaconess by laying his hands upon her. All which shows, that it was the constant practice of the Church to ordain deaconesses by imposition of hands; and that makes it very probable, that the Nicene canon is to be understood in that sense, which is most agreeable to the Church's practice.

But the learned Justellus[5] still raises another scruple about their ordination. He thinks this imposition of hands was not properly an ordination, but only a benediction; for he distinguishes betwixt those two things, and says, "Every solemn imposition of hands is not an ordination:" which is very true; for then the imposition of hands upon the catechumens, or upon the baptized in confirmation, or upon the penitents, in order to reconcile them, or upon the sick, in order to their cure, or upon any persons whatsoever, to give them a common benediction, would be an ordination. But then that learned person seems not to have considered, that the imposition of hands upon the deaconesses was something more than all these; for it was a consecration of them to a certain office in the Church, which sort of imposition of

---

[1] Con. Trull. c. 14 et 40. [2] Sozom. lib. viii. c. 9. [3] Coteler. Not. in Const. Apost. lib. viii. c. 19. Con. Wormstiens. c. 73. ex Con. Chalced. c. 15. [4] Fortun. Vit. Radegundis ap. Surium. Aug. [5] Justel. Bibl. Jur. Canon. tom. i. p. 75. Not. in Con. Nic. c. 19.

hands, joined with a prayer of benediction, for grace to discharge that office aright, is what the Church has always meant, and called particularly by the name of ordination.

SECT. 7.—Not consecrated to any Office of the Priesthood.

Yet we are not to imagine, that this consecration gave them any power to execute any part of the sacerdotal office, or do the duties of the sacred function. Women were always forbidden to perform any such offices as those. Therefore the author of the Constitutions calls it a heathenish practice to ordain women priests, "*ἱερείας χειροτονεῖν*;" for the Christian law allowed no such custom. Some heretics, indeed, as Tertullian [1] observes, allowed women to teach, and exercise, and administer baptism; but all this, he says, was against the rule[2] of the Apostle. Epiphanius brings the charge particularly against the Pepuzians, which were a branch of the Montanists, "that they[3] made women bishops, and women presbyters, abusing that passage of the Apostle, 'In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female,' to put some colour upon their practice." He charges it also upon the Collyridians,[4] "that they did '*Ἱερουργεῖν διὰ γυναικῶν, use women to sacrifice to the Virgin Mary;*" where, it is observed, that the charge is double: 1st, that they gave divine worship to the holy Virgin; and 2dly, that they used women-priests in their service. Against these he has a particular dissertation, wherein he shows at large that no woman, from the foundation of the world, was ever ordained to offer sacrifice, or perform any solemn service[5] of the Church; which, if it had been allowed to any, would certainly have been granted to the Virgin Mary herself, who was so highly favoured of God. But neither she nor any other woman had ever the priest's office committed to

---

[1] Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. 9. [2] Tertul. de Præscript. c. 41. Ipsæ mulieres hæreticæ quàm procaces, quæ audeant docere, contendere, exorcismos agere, curationes repromittere, forsitan et tingere. [3] Id. c. 17. de Baptismo. [4] Epiph. Hær. 49. Pepuzian. n. 2. *Ἐπίσκοποι παρ' αὐτοῖς γυναῖκες, καὶ πρεσβύτεροι γυναῖκες.* [5] Id. Hær. 78. Antidicomarianit. n. 23. [6] Id. Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 3. *Εἰ ἱερατεύειν γυναῖκες Θεῷ προσετάσσοντο, ἢ κανονικόν τι ἐργάζεσθαι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἔδει μᾶλλον αὐτὴν τὴν Μαρίαν ἱερατείαν ἐπιτελέσαι, &c.*

n. "There is, indeed," says he, "an order of deaconesses he Church, but their business[1] is not to sacrifice, or 'orm any part of the sacerdotal office, or any of the 'ed mysteries, but to be a decent help to the female sex he time of their baptism, sickness, affliction, or the like:" therefore he denies, that the Church made them either ıbyteresses or priestesses, "Ἢ πρεσβυτερίδας, ἢ ἱερίσσας;" ɜre the reader is to observe, that Epiphanius puts a distion betwixt the names Πρεσβύτιδας and Πρεσβυτερίδας, ause the former only denotes elderly women, such as deaconesses commonly were; but the latter he uses to ıify persons ordained to the office of presbyters or sts, which he absolutely denies any women in the istian Church to be.

SECT. 8.—Their Offices. 1. To assist at the Baptism of Women.

ınd, from hence it is plain, the offices of the deaconesses 'e only to perform some inferior services of the Church, . those chiefly relating to the women, for whose sake y were ordained. One part of their office was to assist minister at the baptizing of women, where, for decy's sake, they were employed to divest them, (the cus-ı, then, being to baptize all adult persons by immersion) l so to order the matter, that the whole ceremony might performed with all the decency becoming so sacred an ion. This is evident from Epiphanius, both in the fore-ɔd passage, and other places,[2] and it is taken notice of ɔ by Justinian and the author of the Constitutions,[3] o adds, "that the deaconesses were used to anoint the men in baptism with the holy oil;" as the custom of the ɜek Church then was, not only for the bishops, pres-ers, and deacons, but also for the deaconesses to use ı ceremony of unction before baptism; of which Cote-ius in his Notes[4] gives several instances out of the an-nt writers, but these belong to another place.

---

[1] Ibid. Διακονισσῶν τάγμα ἔστιν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ εἰς τὸ ἱερατεύειν, τὶ ἐπιχειρεῖν ἐπιτρέπειν. [2] Epiph. Expos. Fid. n. 21.
ıstin. Novel. vi. c. 6. [4] Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 15.

SECT. 9.—2. To be a Sort of Private Catechists to the Women-Catechumens.

Another part of their office was to be a sort of private catechists to the women-catechumens, who were preparing for baptism. For though they were not allowed to teach publicly in the Church, yet they might privately instruct and teach those, how to make the proper answers that were required of all persons at their baptism. The author of the short Notes on the Epistles,[1] under the name of St. Jerom, calls this, "private ministry of the word," which the deaconesses performed in the eastern Churches in his time. And it was so usual and ordinary a part of their office in the African Churches, that the fathers of the fourth council of Carthage[2] require it as a necessary qualification in deaconesses, when they are ordained, "that they shall be persons of such good understanding, as to be able to instruct the ignorant and rustic women how to make responses to the interrogatories which the minister puts to them in baptism, and how they were to order their conversation afterward."

SECT. 10.—3. To visit and attend Women that were Sick and in Distress.

Another part of their employment was to visit and attend women that were sick, which is noted by Epiphanius[3] and the author of the Constitutions,[4] who says, "they were employed likewise in delivering the bishop's messages and directions to women that were in health, whom the deacons could not visit because of unbelievers;" that is, because of the scandal and reproach which the heathens were ready to cast upon them.

SECT. 11.—4. To Minister to the Martyrs and Confessors in Prison.

In times of danger and persecution they were em-

[1] Hieron. Com. in Rom. xvi. 1. Sicut etiam nunc in Orientalibus Diaconissæ mulieres, in suo sexu ministrare videntur in Baptismo, sive in ministerio Verbi, quia privatim docuisse fœminas invenimus, &c. [2] Con. iv. c. 12. Viduæ vel Sanctimoniales, quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur, tam instructæ sint ad officium, ut possint apto et sano sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres, tempore quo baptizandæ sunt, qualiter Baptizatori interrogatæ respondeant, et qualiter, accepto Baptismate vivant. [3] Epiph. Hær. 79. n. 3. Expos. Fid. n. 21.
[4] Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. 15 et 19. Hieron. Ep. ii. ad Nepot. Multas anus alit Ecclesia, quæ officium ægrotanti præstant, &c.

ıinistering to the martyrs in prison; because they ɜ easily gain access to them, and go with less and less danger and hazard of their lives from ɪn, than the deacons or any other ministers of ı could do. Cotelerius[1] and Gothofred collect some passages in Lucian and Libanius, which ly to refer to this part of the deaconesses' mi- r Lucian, in one of his Dialogues, speaking of the philosopher, how he was caressed by the whilst he was in prison for the profession of ɔn, says, "In the morning one might observe , the widows, waiting at the prison gate[2] with he orphan children;" where by the widows he neans the deaconesses of the Christians. And le question but Libanius[3] means the same, when that the mother or mistress of the old women, inds any one bound in prison, runs about, and ıakes a collection for him." This plainly refers t charity and liberality of the Christians toward rs, which was collected and sent to them by the ıese deaconesses.

12.—5. To attend the Women's Gate in the Church.

Greek Churches the deaconesses had also the he doors of the Church, which part of their office ɜd by the author[4] of the Constitutions, and the ɜr the name of Ignatius,[5] who styles them "Φρουρὸς πυλῶνων, *the keepers of the holy gates.*" But his was only in such Churches as made a distinct the men's gate and the women's gate; for er observes,[6] "that no ancient writers besides nake any mention of this, as part of the office of ıs;" and in another place of the Constitutions[7] tion is plainly expressed; "let the door keepers

ot. in Const. lib. iii. c. 15. Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Theodos. leg. 27. [2] Lucian. Peregrin. Παρὰ τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ ῥαῖδιά, χήρας τινὰς, &c. [3] Liban. Orat. 16. in Testa- t. de Vinctis, cited by Gothofred. [4] Constit. Apost. [5] Pseudo-Ignat. Ep. ad Antioch. n. 12. ırt. 17. in Ignat. p. 224. [7] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57.

stand at the gate of the men, and the deaconesses at the gate of the women."

SECT. 13.—6. To preside over the Widows, &c.

Lastly, they were to assign all women their places, and regulate[1] their behaviour in the Church; to preside over the rest of the widows;[2] whence, in some canons, they are styled Προκαθημένα, *governesses;* as Balsamon and Zonaras note upon the council of Laodicea;[3] and if any woman had any suit to prefer to a deacon or a bishop, a deaconess[4] was to introduce her. These were the offices of the deaconesses in the primitive Church, which I have been a little more particular in describing, because they are not now so commonly known; the order itself having been for some ages wholly laid aside.

SECT. 14.—How long this Order continued in the Church.

If it be inquired, how long this order continued in the Church, and what time it was totally abolished? I answer;—it was not laid aside every where at once, but continued in the Greek Church longer than in the Latin, and in some of the Latin Churches longer than in others. In the Greek Church they continued to the time of Balsamon, that is, to the latter end of the twelfth century; for he speaks of them[5] as then ministering in the Church of Constantinople; though it appears from some other passages of the same author that in other Churches[6] they were generally laid aside. In the Latin Church there were some decrees made against their ordination long before. For the first council of Orange, Anno 441, forbids[7] any more deaconesses to be ordained. And the council of Epone,[8] Anno 517, has a canon to the same purpose, wholly abrogating their consecration. Not long after which the second council of Orleans, Anno 533, renewed the decree[9] against them; and before any of these the council of Laodicea, in the eastern Church

[1] Constit. lib. ii. c. 58. [2] Ibid. lib. iii. c. 7. [3] Con. Laodic. c. 11. [4] Constit. lib. ii. c. 26. [5] Balsam. Resp. ad Interrog. Marci. c. 35. ap. Leunclav. Jus. Gr. Rom. tom. i. p. 381. Id. Com. in Con. Chal. c. 15. [7] Con. Arausic. 1. c. 26. Diaconissæ omnimodæ non ordinandæ, &c. [8] Con. Epaunens. c. 21. Viduarum consecrationem, quas Diaconissas vocant, ab omni religione nostrâ penitùs abrogamus. [9] Con. Aurel. ii. c. 17. Placuit ut nullî postmodùm fœminæ Diaconalis Benedictio pro conditionis ujus fragilitate credatur.

ıd forbidden them under the name of ancient widows or overnesses, decreeing[1] "that no such for the future should ɔ constituted in the Church." But these decrees had no fect at all in the east, nor did they universally take effect the west till many ages after. The author, indeed, under e name of St. Ambrose, would lead an unwary reader to a great mistake; for he makes, as if the order of deaconesses was no where used[2] but among the Montanists; norantly confounding the presbyteresses of the Montanists, with the deaconesses of the Church. And the author, ıder the name of St. Jerom, is not much more to be rerded, when he seems to intimate, "that in his time, the der of deaconesses was wholly laid aside in the west, and ıly retained[3] in the oriental Churches;" for I have already owed, (sect. 6.) from Venantius Fortunatus, who lived, Anno 0, and the council of Worms, which was held in the nth century, that deaconesses were still retained in some ırts of the western Church; which may be evinced also om the *Ordo Romanus*,[4] and other rituals in use about at time, where among other forms we meet with an *Ordo ad Diaconam faciendam, an order or form to concrate a deaconess.*" But, in an age or two after, that is, in e tenth or eleventh century, Bona[5] thinks the whole order as quite extinct.

Sect. 15.—Another Notion of the Name *Diaconissa*, as it signifies a Deacon's Wife.

Before I make an end of this subject, I cannot but quaint the reader, that there is another notion of the name *iaconissa*, sometimes to be met with in the writers of the iddle ages of the Church, who use it to signify not a aconess, but *a deacon's wife*, in the same sense as *Presytera* signifies *the wife of a presbyter*, and *Episcopa, the ife of a bishop.* The word *Episcopa* is thus used in the cond council of Tours, where it is said, "that if a bishop

---

[1] Con. Laodic. c. 11. Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πρεσβύτιδας, ἤτοι προκαθημένας ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ καθίστασθαι. [2] Ambros. Com. in 1 Tim. iii. 11. [3] Hier. Com. in Rom. xvi. 1. and in 1 Tim. iii. 11. [4] Ordo Roman. 161. in Bibl. Patr. tom. ix. par. 1624. [5] Bona, Rer. Liturg. . i.c. 25. n. 15.

have not a wife,[1] there shall no train of women follow him.' So also the words *Presbytera, Diaconissa,* and *Subdiaconissa,*[2] for the *wives of a presbyter, a deacon, and a subdeacon,* occur a little after in the same council; and, so in the council of Auxerre[3] and some other places. From which a learned and ingenious examiner[4] of the council of Trent, concludes, "that bishops in those times were not as yet obliged by the law of celibacy, not to cohabit with their wives, in the Gallician Church." But I shall freely own, I take this to be a mistake: for, from the time of Pope Siricius, the celibacy of the clergy began to be pressed in the western Church, and these very canons do enforce it; therefore I lay no greater stress upon them than they will bear; for as for the cause of the married clergy, it needs not be defended by such arguments, having the rule and practice of the whole Catholic Church, for some of the purest ages, to abet and support it. Of which I shall give a just account hereafter, when I come to consider the general qualifications that were necessarily required of the clergy of the primitive Church, among which the vow of celibacy will be found to have no place. What, therefore, these canons mean, by *Episcopa* and *Presbytera,* is no more than *the wife of a bishop, or presbyter,* which they had before they were ordained, but in those declining ages of the Church were not allowed to cohabit with them, after ordination. This explication agrees both with the scope of those canons, and the practice of the times, they were made in; and we have no dispute with Antonius Augustinus,[5] nor any candid writer of the Romish Communion, who carry this notion no higher than the ages in which it was broached. But when Baronius[6] and others transfer it to the primitive ages, and make the practice of the western Church in the sixth age, to be the practice of the Universal Church in all ages, they manifestly prevaricate, and put a fallacy upon their readers, which it may be sufficient to have hinted here, and shall be more fully made out in its proper place.

---

[1] Con. Turon. 2. c. 14. Episcopum Episcopam non habentem nulla sequatur turba mulierum. [2] Ibid. c. 20. Si inventus fuerit Presbyter cum suâ Presbyterâ, aut Diaconus cum suâ Diaconissâ, aut Subdiaconus cum suâ Subdiaconissâ, annum integrum excommunicatus habeatur. [3] Con. Antisiodor. c. 21. [4] Gentillet. Exam. Con. Trid. lib. iv. p. 259. [5] Anton. Aug. de Emendat. Gratiani, lib. i. dial. 20. p. 226. [6] Baron. an. 58. n. 18.

COMMENCEMENT

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME

IN THE

ORIGINAL EDITION

BY THE AUTHOR.

THE

AUTHOR'S DEDICATION.

TO THE

RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD,

JONATHAN,

LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

And Prelate of the Most Noble Order of the Garter.

MY LORD,

AS the kind entertainment, which your Lordship and the world have been pleased to give to the first part of this work, has encouraged me to go on in hopes of doing public service to the Church; so the nature of the subject contained in this second volume, being but a continuation of the former account of the primitive clergy, obliges me again with all submission to present this second part to your Lordship, in hopes of no less kind acceptance and approbation. The matters here treated of are many of them things of the greatest importance, which when plainly set in order and presented to public view, may perhaps excite the zeal of many in the present age, to copy out those necessary duties, by the practice of which the primitive

Church attained to great perfection and glory; and, as I may say, still provokes and calls us to the same attainments by so many excellent rules and noble examples. In the fourth and sixth of these books, I have endeavoured to draw up something of the general character of the primitive clergy, by showing what qualifications were required in them before their ordination, and what sort of laws they were to be governed by afterwards; respecting both their lives and labours, in the continual exercise of the duties of their function. Many of them, I must own, have been very affecting to myself in the consideration of them; and as I was willing to hope they might prove so to such others as would be at the pains to read them. For here are both directions and provocations of the best sort, to excite our industry, and inflame our zeal, and to make us eager and restless in copying out the pattern set before us. If any shall think I have collected these things together to reflect upon any persons in the present age, I shall only say with one of the ancients[1] in a like case, "They mistake my design; which was not to reproach any man's person, who bears the sacred character of a priest, but to write what might be for the public benefit of the Church. For, as when orators and philosophers describe the qualities, which are required to make a complete orator or philosopher, they do no injury to Demosthenes or Plato, but only describe things nakedly in themselves without any personal applications; so in the description of a bishop or priest, and ex-

[1] Hieron. Ep. 83. ad Ocean. tom. ii. p. 323. Ne quis me in sugillationem istius temporis Sacerdotum scripsisse, quæ scripsi, existimet, sed in Ecclesiæ utilitatem. Ut enim oratores et philosophi, describentes qualem velint esse perfectum oratorem et philosophum, non faciunt injuriam Demostheni et Platoni, sed res ipsas absque personis definiunt: sic in descriptione Episcopi, et in eorum expositione, quæ scripta sunt, quasi speculum Sacerdotii proponitur. Jam in potestate et conscientiâ singulorum est, quales se ibi aspiciant; ut vel dolere ad deformitatem, vel gaudere ad pulchritudinem possint.

plication of ancient rules, nothing more is intended but to propose a mirror of the priesthood; in which it will be in every man's power and conscience to take a view of himself, so as either to grieve at the sight of his own deformity, or rejoice when he beholds his own beauty in the glass."

Nothing is here proposed but rules and examples of the noblest virtues; probity and integrity of life; studies and labours becoming the clerical function; piety and devotion in our constant addresses to God; fidelity, diligence, and prudence in preaching his word to men; carefulness and exactness, joined with discretion and charity, in the administration of public and private discipline; candour and ingenuity in composing needless disputes among good men; and zeal in opposing and confronting the powerful and wily designs of heretics and wicked men; together with resolution and patience in suffering persecutions, calumnies, and reproaches, both from professed enemies and pretended friends; with many other instances of the like commendable virtues, which shined in the lives, and adorned the profession of the primitive clergy: whose rules and actions, I almost promise myself, your Lordship and all good men will read with pleasure, because they will but see their own beauty represented in the glass; and they that fall short of the character here given, will find it a gentle admonition and spur to set in order the things that are wanting in their conduct, and to labour with more zeal to bring themselves a little nearer to the primitive standard.

Your Lordship is enabled by your high station and calling to revive the exercise of ancient discipline among your clergy in a more powerful way; and you have given us already some convincing proofs, that it is your settled resolution and intention so to do. As the thoughts of this is a real pleasure to the diligent and virtuous, so it is to be

hoped it will prove a just terror to those of the contrary character; and by introducing a strict discipline among the clergy, make way for the easier introduction of it among the laity also; the revival of which has long been desired, though but slow steps are made toward the restoration of it. In the mean time, it becomes every man according to his ability, though in a lower station, to contribute his endeavours toward the promoting these good ends; to which purpose I have collected and digested these observations upon the laws and discipline of the ancient clergy, that such as are willing to be influenced by their practice, may have great and good examples set before them: whilst they, whom examples cannot move, may be influenced another way, by the authority which your Lordship and others in the same station are invested with, for the benefit and edification of the Church; the promoting of which is, and ever will be the hearty endeavour of him, who is,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most dutiful

and obedient servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

Headbourn-Worthy,
1710.

BOOK III.

OF THE INFERIOR ORDERS OF THE CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the first Original of the Inferior Orders, and the Number and Use of them: and how they differed from the Superior Orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons.

Sect. 1.—The Inferior Orders not of Apostolical, but only Ecclesiastical Institution, proved against Baronius and the Council of Trent.

HAVING in the last book discoursed of the superior orders of the clergy in the primitive Church, I come now to treat of those which are commonly called the inferior orders. And here our first inquiry must be concerning the original and number of them. The two great oracles of the Romish Church, Baronius[1] and the council[2] of Trent, are very dogmatical and positive in their assertions, both about their rise and number, "that they are precisely five, viz. subdeacons, acolythists, exorcists, readers, and doorkeepers; and that they are all of apostolical institution." And herein they are followed not only by Bellarmine,[3] and the common writers of that side, but also by Schelstrate,[4] a person who lived in greater light, and might have seen through the mists that were cast before the eyes of others. Cardinal Bona[5] distinguishes between subdeacons and the

---

[1] Baron, an. 44. n. 78. [2] Con. Trid. Sess. 23. c. 2. It. Catechism. ad Parochos. Tit. de Sacramento Ordinis, p. 222. [3] Bellarm. de Clericis. lib. i. c. 11. [4] Schelstrat. Concil. Antiochen. Restitut. Dissert. 4. c. 17. art. 2. p. 520. [5] Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. 25. n. 17. Acolythos, Exorcistas, Lectores, et Ostiarios, ab Apostolis, vel ab immediatis eorum successoribus institutos, Doctores Scholastici asserunt, sed non probant.

rest. He fairly owns, "that acolythists, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, are not of apostolical institution," as the modern schoolmen pretend: but, as to subdeacons, he joins with them entirely, and says,[1] "that though the Scripture makes no express mention of them, yet their institution must be referred either to Christ, or at least to his Apostles." The French writers are not generally so tenacious of this opinion, as having never sworn to receive the decrees of the Tridentine fathers with an implicit faith; but many of them ingenuously confess the rise of the inferior orders to be owing only to ecclesiastical institution. Morinus[2] undertakes to prove "that there was no such order as that of acolythists, or exorcists, or door-keepers among the Greeks in the age next to the Apostles;" nor does Schelstrate disprove his arguments, though he makes a show of refuting him. Duarenus[3] says, "there were no such orders originally in the first and primitive Church." Cotelerius[4] confesses "their original is involved wholly in obscurity; that there is no mention made of any of them in Ignatius, or any other ancient writer before Cyprian and Tertullian." And therefore Habertus[5] is clearly of opinion, "that it would be more adviseable for their Church to expunge all the inferior orders out of the number and catalogue of sacraments, and refer them only to ecclesiastical institution, as the ancient divines were used to do." By the ancient divines he means the schoolmen, who were generally of this opinion heretofore. For Peter Lombard, who is set at the head of them, declares[6] "that the primitive Church had no orders below those of presbyters and dea-

---

[1] Bona, ibid. n. 16. Subdiaconorum licèt expressa mentio in Sacris Literis non reperiatur, eorum tamen institutio vel ad Christum, ut recentiores Scholastici existimant, vel ad Apostolos referenda est. [2] Morin. de Ordinat. exercit. 14. c. 1. [3] Duaren. de Minister. et Beneficiis Eccl. lib. i. c. 14. [4] Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. lib. ii. c. 25. [5] Habert. Archieratic. part 5. observ. 1. p. 48. Consultius, meo quidem judicio, Ordines Hierarchicis inferiores, ipsumque adeò Hypodiaconi, et à Sacramentorum censu expungere, et ad institutionem duntaxàt ecclesiasticam cum antiquis Theologis referre. [6] Lombard. Sent. lib. iv. dist. 24. p. 348. Hos solos primitiva Ecclesia legitur habuisse, et de his solis præceptum Apostoli habemus. Subdiaconos verò et Acolythos procedente tempore Ecclesia sibi constituit

cons; nor did the Apostle give command about any other; but the Church in succeeding ages instituted subdeacons and acolythists herself." And this is the opinion of Aquinas,[1] and Amalarius Fortunatus,[2] and many others. Schelstrate himself[3] owns, "that it was the opinion of two Popes, Urban the Second and Innocent the Third, that the order of subdeacons was not reckoned among the sacred orders of the primitive Church." It was indeed an inferior order in the third century, but not dignified with the title of a sacred or superior order till the twelfth age of the Church; when, as Menardus informs us out of a MS. book of Petrus Cantor,[4] a writer of that age, it was then but just newly dignified with that character; that is, in an age when bishops and presbyters began to be reckoned but one order, in compliance with an hypothesis peculiar to the Romish Church, then the order of subdeacons stepped up to be a superior order. And whereas the primitive Church was used to reckon the three superior orders to be those of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, the Romish Church now began to speak in a different style, and count the three superior orders those of priests, deacons, and subdeacons: so that this last became a superior order, which for some ages before had been only an inferior order, and at first was no order at all. For the testimonies alleged by Schelstrate, after Bellarmine and Baronius, to prove the inferior orders of apostolical institution, are of no authority or weight in this case. The Epistle, under the name of Ignatius ad Antiochenos, and the Constitutions, under the name of Clemens Romanus, which are the only authorities pretended in this matter, are now vulgarly known to be none of their genuine writings, but the works of some authors of much later date. So that till some better proofs be given, there will be reason to conclude, that these inferior orders were not of apostolical, but only of ecclesiastical institution.

---

[1] Aquin. Supplement. par. 3. q. 37. art. 2. Resp. ad Secundum.
[2] Amalar. de Offic. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 6. [3] Schelstrat. de Concil. Antioch. p. 515. [4] Pet. Cantor, de Verbo Mirifico, ap. Menard. Not. in Sacramental. Gregor. p. 280. De novo institutum est, Subdiaconatum esse sacrum Ordinem

SECT. 2.—No certain Number of them in the Primitive Church.

And this may be argued further, not only from the silence of the most ancient writers, but also from the accounts of those who speak of them presently after their institution. For though the Romish Church determines them to be precisely five in number, yet in the ancient Church there was no such rule; but some acounts speak of more than five, and others not of so many: which argues that they were not of apostolical institution. The author under the name of Ignatius[1] reckons six, without acolythists, viz. subdeacons, readers, singers, door-keepers, copiatæ, and exorcists. The author of the Constitutions, under the name of Clemens Romanus,[2] counts but four of these orders, viz. subdeacons, readers, singers, and door-keepers: for he makes no mention of the copiatæ, or of acolythists; and though he speaks of exorcists, yet he says[3] expressly it was no Church-order. The Apostolical Canons,[4] as they are commonly called, name only three, subdeacons, readers, and singers. And though the author under the name of St. Jerom[5] mentions four; yet he brings the *Copiatæ* or *Fossarii* into the account, and makes them the first order of the clergy, leaving out acolythists and exorcists. Epiphanius[6] makes no mention of acolythists, but instead of them puts in the copiatæ and intepreters. Others add the *Parabolani* also; and, except Cornelius,[7] there is scarce any other ancient writer, who is so precise to the nnmber of five inferior orders, as now computed in the Church of Rome.

SECT. 3.—Not instituted in all Churches at the same Time.

The reason of which difference must needs be this, that there was no certain rule left originally about any such orders; but every Church instituted them for herself, at such times and in such numbers as her own necessities seemed to require. For at first, most of the offices of these

---

[1] Ep. ad Antioch. n. 12. [2] Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. 11.
[3] Ibid. lib. viii. c. 26. [4] Can. Apost. c. 69. [5] Jerom. de Sept. Ordin. Eccl. tom. iv. p. 81. [6] Epiphan. Expos. Fid. n. 21.
[7] Cornel. Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43.

rior orders were performed by the deacons, as I have occasion to show in another place.[1] But as the num- of converts increased in large Churches, such as that of ne, which confined herself to the number of seven dea- s, the duties of the deacon's office quickly became too at and heavy for them; whereupon a sort of assistants to m were appointed, first in those great Churches, under names of these inferior orders, to take off from the dea- s some of the heavy burden that lay upon them. And t is the reason why we meet with the inferior orders in h great and populous Churches as Rome and Carthage he beginning of the third century; whereas, in many of lesser Churches all the offices were still performed by cons, even in the fourth and fifth centuries; which may concluded from the words of the author under the name St. Austin,[2] where, speakiug of the deacons of Rome, says, "The reason why they did not perform all the in- or services of the Church, was, that there was a multi- e of the lesser clergy under them; whereas otherwise y must have taken care of the altar and its utensils, &c. t was in other Churches at that time;" which seems evi- ıtly to imply, that these inferior orders were not taken all Churches when that author made this observation.

r. 4.—The principal Use of them in the Primitive Church, to be a Sort of Nursery for the Hierarchy.

but such Churches as admitted them, made them sub- vient to divers good ends and purposes; for besides t of relieving the deacons in some part of their office, y were also a sort of nursery for the sacred hierarchy, or erior orders of the Church. For, in those days such ırches as had these orders settled in them, commonly se their superior ministers, bishops, presbyters, and dea- s, out of them; and the clergy of these lesser orders

---

book ii. chap. 20. sect. 15. [2] Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. iv. c. 101. Ut autem non omnia ministeria obsequiorum per ordinem ıt, multitudo facit Clericorum. Nam utique et altare portarent, et vasa , et aquam in manus funderent Sacerdoti, sicut videmus per omnes esias.

were a sort of candidates under trial and probation for the greater. For the Church, not having the advantage of Christian academies at that time, took this method to train up fit persons for the ministry; first exercising them in some of the lower offices, that they might be the better disciplined and qualified for the duties of the superior functions. And by this means every bishop knew perfectly both the abilities and morals of all the clergy of his diocese; for they were bred up under his eye, and governed by his care and inspection. In some places they lived all in one house, and eat all at one table; as Possidius[1] particularly notes of St. Austin's Church at Hippo, and Sozomen[2] of the Church of Rinocurura in the confines of Palæstine and Egypt, "that they had house and table, and every thing in common." Hence it became a custom in Spain, in the time of the Gothic kings, about the end of the fifth century, for parents to dedicate their children very young to the service of the Church; in which case they were taken into the bishop's family, and educated under him by some discreet and grave presbyter, whom the bishop deputed for that purpose, and set over them by the name of *Præpositus*, and *Magister Disciplinæ, the superintendant*, or *master of discipline*, because his chief business was to inspect their behaviour, and instruct them in the rules and discipline of the Church; as we may see in the second and fourth councils[3] of Toledo, which give directions about this affair.

SECT. 5.—Not allowed to forsake their Service, and return to a mere Secular Life again.

And upon this account these inferior clergy were tied as

---

[1] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 25. Cum ipso semper Clerici, unâ etiam domo ac mensâ, sumptibusque communibus alebantur et vestiebantur. [2] Sozom. lib. vi. c. 31. Κοινὴ δέ ἐστι τοῖς αὐτόθι κληρικοῖς οἰκήσις καὶ τράπεζα καὶ τἄλλα πάντα. [3] Con. Tolet. ii. c. 1. De his quos voluntas Parentum à primis infantiæ annis in Clericatûs Officio vel Monachali posuit, statuimus - - - ut in Domo Ecclesiæ sub Episcopali præsentiâ à Præposito sibi debeant erudiri. It. Tolet. iv. c. 23. Si qui in Clero Puberes aut Adolescentes existunt, omnes in uno conclavi atrii commorentur, ut in Disciplinis Ecclesiasticis agant, deputato probatissimo Seniore, quem et Magistrum Disciplinæ et Testem vitæ habeant.

ell as others, to the perpetual service of the Church, hen once they had devoted and dedicated themselves to They might not then forsake their station, and return to mere secular life again at their own pleasure. The coun- l of Chalcedon[1] has a peremptory canon to this purpose: That if any person ordained among the clergy betake mself to any military or civil employment, and does not pent and return to the office he had first chosen for God's ke, he should be anathematized;" which is repeated in e council of Tours,[2] and Tribur,[3] and some others, where is interpreted so as to include the inferior orders as well the superior.

ST. 6.—How they differed from the Superior Orders, in Name, in Office, and in Manner of Ordination.

But though they agreed in this, yet in other respects they ffered very much from one another. As first, in name: the ergy of the superior orders are commonly called the ρώμενοι, *holy*, and *sacred*,[4] as in Socrates and others; whence e name, hierarchy, is used by the author under the name Dionysius,[5] the Areopagite, to signify peculiarly the ders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons; as Hallier, a nous Sorbonne doctor, has abundantly proved against ellotius, the Jesuit, in his learned and elaborate Defence[6] the Hierarchy of the Church. But on the other hand, the ferior orders in the ancient canons have only the name of *sacrati, unconsecrated;* as in the council of Agde,[7] where e *Insacrati Ministri* are forbidden to touch the sacred ssels, or to enter into the *Diaconicon*, or *sanctuary*, it is ain there must be meant the inferior orders. 2. Another ference, which gave rise to the former distinction, was

---

Con. Chal. c. 7. Τὸς ἅπαξ ἐν κλήρῳ τεταγμένυς ὡρίσαμεν, μήτε ἐπὶ ιτειαν, μήτε ἐπὶ ἀξίαν κοσμικὴν ἔρχεσθαι, &c. [2] Siquis Clericus cto officii sui Ordine, laicam voluerit agere vitam, vel se militiæ tradi- it, excommunicationis pœnâ feriatur. [3] Con. Triburiens. c. 27. ocrat. lib. i. c. 10 et 15. [5] Dionys. de Hierar. Eccles. c. 5. n. 2. allier Defensio Hierarch. Eccles. lib. i. c. 3. Lib. iii. sect. 2. c. 1 et 2. on. Agathen. c. 66. Non licet Insacratos Ministros licentiam habere, in retarium, quod Græci Diaconicon appellant, ingredi, et contingere vasa minica.

the different ceremonies observed in the manner of their ordination. The one were always ordained at the altar; the others not so: the one with the solemn rite of imposition of hands; the other commonly without it. Whence St. Basil[1] calls the one Βαθμὸς, *a degree;* but the other Ἀχειροτόνητος ὑπηρεσία, *an inferior ministry which had no imposition of hands.* 3. The main difference was in the exercise of their office and function. The one were ordained to minister before God as priests, to celebrate his sacraments, to expound his word publicly in the Church, &c. In which respects the three superior orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons are said by Optatus, and others, to have each their share and degree in the Christian priesthood, as has been noted in the former book:[2] but the inferior orders were not appointed to any such ministry, but only to attend the ministers in divine service, and perform some lower and ordinary offices, which any Christian, by the bishop's appointment, was qualified to perform. What these offices were, shall be showed by a particular account of them in the following chapters.

CHAP. II.

Of Subdeacons.

SECT. 1.—No mention of Subdeacons, till the Third Century.

THE first notice we have of this order in any ancient writers is in the middle of the third century, when Cyprian and Cornelius lived, who both speak of subdeacons as settled in the Church in their time. Cyprian[3] mentions them at least ten times in his Epistles; and Cornelius, in his famous Epistle[4] to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, where he gives a catalogue of the clergy then belonging to the Church of Rome, reckons seven subdeacons among them.

---

[1] Basil. Ep. Canon. c. 51. [2] See Book ii. chap. xix. sect. 15.
[3] Cypr. Ep. 8, 20, 29, 34, 35, 45, 78, 79, ed. Oxon. [4] Ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43.

But some think they were not quite so early in the Greek Church; for Habertus[1] says, no Greek writer speaks of them before Athanasius,[2] who lived in the fourth century.

SECT. 2.—Their Ordination performed without Imposition of Hands in the Latin Church.

The author of the Constitutions indeed refers them to an apostolical original, and in compliance with that hypothesis brings in Thomas, the Apostle, giving direction to bishops to ordain them with imposition[3] of hands and prayer, as he does for all the rest of the inferior orders. But that author is singular in this; for it does not appear to have been the practice of the Greek Church, whose customs he chiefly represents. St. Basil, a more credible witness, says of this and all the other inferior orders, that they[4] were "Ἀχειροτόνητοι, *ordained without imposition of the hands.*" And, for the Latin Church, it is evident from a canon of the fourth council of Carthage, where we have the form and manner of their ordination thus expressed:[5] "When a subdeacon is ordained, seeing he has no imposition of hands, let him receive an empty patin and an empty cup from the hands of the bishop, and an ewer and towel from the archdeacon." Which form, wholly excluding imposition of hands, is a good collateral evidence (as Habertus[6] confesses ingenuously) to prove that this order was not instituted by the Apostles; for they did not use to omit this ceremony in any of their ordinations.

SECT. 3.—A brief Account of their Office.

As to the office of subdeacons, we may in some measure learn what it was from the forementioned canon, viz.—"that it was to fit and prepare the sacred vessels and utensils of the altar, and deliver them to the deacon in time of divine

---

[1] Habert. Archieratic. p. 49. [2] Athan. Ep. ad. Solitar. Vit. agent. [3] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 21. [4] Basil. Ep. Canon. c. 51. [5] Con. Carth. iv. c. 5. Subdiaconus quum ordinatur, quia manûs impositionem non accipit, patinam de Episcopi manu accipiat vacuam, et calicem vacuum. De manu verò Archidiaconi, urceolum cum aquâ, et mantile, et manutergium. [6] Habert. Archieratic. p. 48.

service." But they were not allowed to minister as deacons at the altar; no, nor so much as to come within the rails of it, to set a patin, or cup, or the oblations of the people thereon; as appears from a canon[1] of the council of Laodicea, which forbids the Ὑπηρέται, by which is meant *subdeacons*, to have any place within the *Diaconicon*, or *sanctuary*, nor to touch the holy vessels, meaning at the communion-table. Though this is now their office in the Church of Rome; and in that, Bona[2] owns they differ from those of the ancient Church. Another of their offices was to attend the doors of the Church during the communion-service. This is mentioned by the council of Laodicea, in a canon[3] which fixes them to that station. And Valesius thinks Eusebius meant them, when, describing the temple of Paulinus, he speaks[4] of some, whose office it was, "Θυραυλεῖν καὶ ποδηγεῖν τὸς εἰσιόντας, *to attend the doors, and conduct those that came in, to their proper places.*" The author of the Constitutions[5] divides this office between the deacons and subdeacons, ordering the deacons to stand at the men's gate, and the subdeacons at the women's, that no one might go forth, nor the doors be opened in the time of the oblation. Besides these offices in the Church, they had another office out of the Church, which was to go on the bishop's embassies, with his letters or messages to foreign Churches. For in those days, by reason of the persecutions, a bishop did not so much as send a letter to a foreign Church but by the hands of one of his clergy; whence Cyprian[6] gives such letters the name of *Literæ Clericæ;* and the subdeacons were the men that were commonly employed in this office: as appears from every one of those Epistles in Cyprian, which speak of subdeacons; particularly in that, which he wrote to the clergy of

---

[1] Con. Laodic. c. 21. [2] Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. 25. n. 16. Olim nec calicem, nec patinam, nec oblationes in altari ponebant.

[3] Con. Laodic. c. 22. Ὀυ δεῖ ὑπηρέτην τὰς θύρας ἐγκαταλιμπάνειν.

[4] Euseb. Hist. lib. x. c. 4. [5] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 11.

[6] Cypr. Ep. 4. al. 9. Grave est si Epistolæ Clericæ veritas mendacio aliquo et fraude corrupta est.

Carthage in his retirement, where he[1] tells them, "that having occasion to write to the Church of Rome, and needing some of the clergy to convey his letter by, he was obliged to ordain a new subdeacon for this purpose, because the Church could not spare him one at that time, having scarce enough left to perform her own daily services." These were anciently the chief of the subdeacons offices at their first institution.

SECT. 4.—What Offices they might not perform.

And great care was taken, that they should not exceed their bounds, or encroach too much upon the deacon's offices. They might not take upon them to minister the bread[2] or the cup to the people at the Lord's table; they might not bid the prayers, nor do any part of that service which the deacons did, as they were the Κήρυκες, or *holy cryers of the Church*. This is the meaning of the canon[3] of the council of Laodicea, which prohibits the subdeacons from wearing an *horarium* in the time of divine service; which was an habit of deacons, that they made use of as a signal to give notice of the prayers, and other services of the Church, to the catechumens, penitents, &c. who were to observe their directions: this habit therefore the subdeacons might not wear, because it was a distinguishing habit of a superior order. And further, to show the same subjection and deference to deacons, as deacons did to presbyters, they are forbidden by another canon[4] of that council to sit in the presence of a deacon without his leave.

SECT. 5.—The Singularity of the Church of Rome, in keeping to the precise Number of Seven Subdeacons.

There is but one thing more I shall note concerning this order, which is the singularity of the Church of Rome, in

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. 24. al. 29. Quoniam oportuit me per Clericos scribere;—Scio autem nostros plurimos absentes esse, paucos verò, qui illic sunt, vix ad ministerium quotidiani operis sufficere; necesse fuit novos aliquos constituere, qui mitterentur: Fecisse me autem sciatis Lectorem Saturum, et Hypodiaconum Optatum Confessorem. [2] Con. Laodic. c. 25. Οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτας ἄρτον διδόναι, οὐδὲ ποτήριον εὐλογεῖν. [3] Ibid. c. 22. Οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτην ὡράριον φορεῖν, &c. [4] Con. Laodic. c. 20.

keeping to the number of seven subdeacons. For in the Epistle of Cornelius,[1] which gives us the catalogue of the Romish clergy, we find but seven deacons, and seven subdeacons, though there were forty-four presbyters, and forty-two acolythists, and of exorcists, readers, and door-keepers no less than fifty-two. But other Churches did not tie themselves to follow this example. For, in the great Church of Constantinople, and three lesser that belonged to it, there were ninety subdeacons, as may be seen in one of Justinian's Novels,[2] where he gives a catalogue of the clergy and fixes the number of every order, amounting to above five hundred in the whole.

CHAP. III.

Of Acolythists.

SECT. 1.—Acolythists an Order peculiar to the Latin Church, and never mentioned by any Greek Writers for Four Centuries.

NEXT to the subdeacons, the Latin writers commonly put acolythists, which was an order peculiar to the Latin Church; for there was no such order in the Greek Church for above four hundred years; nor is it ever so much as mentioned among the orders of the Church by any Greek writer all that time, as Cabassutius,[3] and Schelstrate,[4] confess. And though it occurs sometimes in the latter Greek rituals, yet Schelstrate says, it is there only another name, for the order of subdeacons. But in the Latin Church these two were distinguished; for Cornelius, in his catalogue, makes a plain difference between them, in saying, there were forty-two acolythists, and but seven subdeacons in the Church of Rome. Cyprian also speaks of them[5] frequently, in his epistles, as distinct from the order of sub-

---

[1] Ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. [2] Justin. Novel. iii. [3] Cabassut. Notit. Con. c. 42. p. 249. [4] Schelstrat. de Con. Antiocheno Dissert. iv. c. 17. p. 526. [5] Cypr. Ep. 7, 34, 52, 59, 77, 78, 79, ed. Oxon.

deacons; though wherein their offices differed, is not very easy to determine from either of those authors.

Sect. 2.—Their Ordination and Office.

But in the fourth council of Carthage there is a canon which gives a little light in the matter; for there we have the form of their ordination, and some intimation of their office also. The canon[1] is to this effect:—"When any acolythist is ordained, the bishop shall inform him how he is to behave himself in his office; and he shall receive a candlestick, with a taper in it, from the archdeacon, that he may understand that he is appointed to light the candles of the Church. He shall also receive an empty pitcher, to furnish wine for the eucharist of the blood of Christ." So that the acolythyst's office seems at that time to have consisted chiefly in these two things: lighting the candles of the Church, and attending the ministers with wine for the eucharist; the designation to which office needed no imposition of hands, but only the bishop's appointment, as is plain from the words of the canon now cited.

Sect. 3.—The Origination of the Name.

Some think[2] they had another office, which was to accompany and attend the bishop whithersoever he went; and that they were called acolythists upon this account; or, perhaps, because they were obliged to attend at funerals in the company of the *Canonicæ* and *Ascetriæ*, with whom they are joined in one of Justinian's[3] Novels. The original word, Ἀκόλουθος, as Hesychius[4] explains it, signifies a young servant, or an attendant who waits continually upon another: and the name seems to be given them from this. But the inference which a learned person[5] makes from

---

[1] Con. Carth. iv. c. 6. Acolythus quum ordinatur, ab Episcopo quidem doceatur qualiter in officio suo agere debeat: sed ab Archidiacono accipiat ceroferarium cum cereo, ut sciat se ad accendenda Ecclesiæ luminaria mancipari. Accipiat et urceolum vacuum ad suggerendum vinum in Eucharistiam sanguinis Christi.

[2] Duaren. de Minister. et Benefic. lib. i. c. 14.

[3] Justin. Novel. 59.

[4] Hesych. Ἀκόλουθος, ὁ νεώτερος παῖς, θεράπων, ὁ περὶ τὸ σῶμα.

[5] Bp. Fell Not. in Cypr. Ep. vii.

hence, that the order of acolythists was first in the Greek Church, because the name is of Greek original, seems not to be so certain; because it can hardly be imagined, that it should be an order of the Greek Church, and yet no writer before Justinian's time make any mention of it.

SECT. 4.—Whether Acolythists be the same with the *Deputati* and *Ceroferarii* of later Ages.

I know, indeed, St. Jerom[1] says, "it was a custom in the Oriental Churches to set up lighted tapers when the Gospel was read, as a token and demonstration of their joy;" but he does not so much as once intimate, that they had a peculiar order of acolythists for this purpose; nor does it appear that this was any part of their office in the Latin Church. For that, which the council of Carthage speaks of, is probably no more than lighting the candles at night, when the Church was to meet for their *Lucernalis Oratio*, or *evening prayer*. This office of acolythists, as much as the Romanists contend for the apostolical institution of it, is now no longer in being in the Church of Rome, but changed into that of the *ceroferarii*, or *taper-bearers*, whose office is only to walk before the deacons, &c. with a lighted taper in their hands: which is so different from the office of the ancient acolythists, that Duarenus[2] cannot but express his wonder, how the one came to be changed into the other, and why their doctors should call him an acolythist of the ancient Church, who is no more than a taper-bearer of the present. Cardinal Bona[3] carries the reflection a little further, and with some resentment complains, that the inferior orders of the Romish Church bear no resemblance to those of the primitive Church, and that for five hundred years the ancient discipline has been lost.

[1] Hieron. cont. Vigilant. tom. ii. p. 123. Per totas Orientis Ecclesias, quandò legendum est Evangelium, accenduntur lumina, &c. [2] Duaren. de Minister. et Benefic. lib. i. c. 14. p. 74. Nescio quomodò tandem factum est, ut hoc munus in Luminariorum curam posteà conversum sit, et Doctores nostri passim Acolythos Ceroferarios interpretentur. [3] Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. 35. n. 18. Desierunt quoque minorum Ordinum officia, quæ plerumque à pueris, et hominibus mercede conductis, nullisque ordinibus initiatis exercentur, &c.

CHAP. IV.

Of Exorcists.

SECT. I.—Exorcists at first no peculiar Order of the Clergy.

THERE is nothing more certain, than that in the apostoli- l age, and the next following, the power of exorcising, or sting out Devils, was a miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost, t confined to the clergy, much less to any single order ong them, but given to other Christians also; as many ner extraordinary spiritual gifts then were. Origen[1] says, rivate Christians (that is laymen) did, by their prayers d adjurations, dispossess Devils." And Socrates[2] ob- ves particularly of Gregory Thaumaturgus, "that whilst was a layman he wrought many miracles, healing the k, and casting out Devils, by sending letters to the pos- sed party only." And that this power was common to orders of Christians, appears further from the challenges the ancient Apologists, Tertullian,[3] and others, to the athens, wherein they undertake, that if they would bring y person possessed with a Devil into open court, before magistrate, any ordinary Christian should make him con- s that he was a Devil and not a God. Minucius[4] speaks of s power among Christians, but he does not ascribe it to y particular order of men: as neither does Justin Martyr,[5] r Irenæus,[6] nor Cyprian,[7] nor Arnobius,[8] though they quently speak of such a power in the Church.

Orig. cont. Cels. lib.vii. p. 334. Ἐυχῇ καὶ ὁρκώσεσιν ἰδιῶται τὸ τοιοῦτο πράσσουσι, &c. [2] Socrat. lib. iv. c. 27. Λαικὸς ὢν πολλὰ θαυμάσια ἐποίησε νοσοῦντας θεραπεύων, καὶ δαίμονας δι ἐπιστολῶν φυγαδεύων. ertul. Apol. c. 23. Edatur hic aliquis sub Tribunalibus vestris, quem mone agi constet. Jussus à quolibet Christiano loqui Spiritus ille, tam se monem confitebitur de vero, quam alibi Deum de falso. [4] Minuc. av. p. 83. Ipsos Dæmonas de semetipsis confiteri, quoties à nobis tormen- rerborum et orationis incendiis de corporibus exiguntur. [5] Justin. ol. i. p. 45. [6] Iren. lib. ii. c. 56 et 57. [7] Cypr. ad Donat. . [8] Arnob. cont. Gent. lib. i.

SECT. 2.—Bishops and Presbyters, for the Three First Centuries, the usual Exorcists of the Church.

But as this gift was common to all orders of men, so it is reasonable to believe, that it was in a more especial manner conferred upon the bishops and presbyters of the Church, who, when there was any occasion to use any exorcism in the Church, were the ordinary ministers of it. Thus Cardinal Bona[1] understands that famous passage of Tertullian, where, speaking[2] of a Christian woman, who went to the theatre, and returned possessed with a Devil, he says, "The unclean spirit was rebuked in exorcism for presuming to make such an attempt upon a believer;"—to which the spirit replied, "That he had a right to her, because he found her upon his own ground." This exorcism, I say, Bona supposes to be performed by some presbyter of the Church, endowed with that miraculous gift. And the like may be said of those exorcists in Cyprian,[3] who cast out Devils by a divine power: and of those also, who are mentioned by Firmilian,[4] as persons inspired by divine grace to discern Evil-Spirits, and detect them; as one of them did a woman of Cappadocia, who pretended to be inspired, and to work miracles, and to baptize, and consecrate the eucharist by divine direction. These exorcisms were plainly miraculous, and prove nothing more than that some persons had such a gift, who probably were some eminent presbyters of the Church; at least they do not prove that exorcists were as yet become any distinct orders among the clergy in the Church.

SECT. 3.—In what Sense every Man his own Exorcist.

Some think the order was as old as Tertullian, because Ulpian, the great lawyer, who lived in Tertullian's time, in

---

[1] Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. 25. n. 17. [2] Tertul. de Spectac. c. 26. Theatrum adiit, et inde cum Dæmonio rediit. Itaque in Exorcismo cum conraretur immundus Spiritus, quòd ausus esset Fidelem aggredi: "constanter et justissimè quidem," inquit, "feci, in meo enim inveni." [3] Cypr. Ep. 76. al. 69. ad Magnum, p. 187. Quod hodiè etiam geritur, ut per Exorcistas, voce humanâ et potestate divinâ, flagelletur, et uratur, et torqueatur Diabolus. [4] Firmil. Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. p. 226. Unus de Exorcistis—inspiratus Dei gratiâ fortiter restitit, et esse illum nequissimum Spiritum, qui prius Sanctus putabatur, ostendit.

one of his books[1] speaks of *exorcizing*, as a thing used by impostors, by whom probably he means the Christians. Gothofred thinks he means the Jewish exorcists, who were commonly impostors indeed. But admitting that he means Christians, (which is more probable, considering what Lactantius[2] says of him, "That he published a collection of the penal laws that had been made against them,") yet it proves no more than what every one owns,—that exorcizing was a thing then commonly known and practised among the Christians. Others urge the authority of Tertullian himself in his book, *De Coronâ Militis;* where yet he is so far from owning any particular order of exorcists, that he rather seems to make every man his own exorcist. For there among other arguments, which he urges to dissuade Christians from the military life under heathen emperors, he makes use of this,[3] "That they would be put to guard the idol-temples, and then they must defend those Devils by night, whom they had put to flight by day by their exorcisms," by which he means their prayers, as Junius rightly understands him. And so in another place, dissuading Christians from selling such things as would contribute towards upholding of Idolatry, or the worship of Devils, he argues thus; That otherwise the Devils would be their *Alumni;* that is, might be said to be fostered and maintained by them, so long as they furnished out materials to carry on their service. "And with what confidence," says he,[4] "can any man exorcize his own *Alumni*, those Devils, whose service he makes his own house an armoury to maintain?" Vicecomes[5] and Bona,[6] by mistake, understand this as spoken of exorcism before baptism, taking the word *Alumni*, to signify the catechumens of the Church; whereas, indeed, it signifies Devils in this place, who are so called by Tertullian, in respect of those, who contribute to uphold

---

[1] Ulpian, lib. viii. de Tribunal, in Digest. lib. l. tit. xiii. leg. l. Si incantavit, si imprecatus est, si (ut vulgari verbo impostorum utor) exorcisavit.
[2] Lact. Instit. lib. v. c. 11. [3] Tertul. de Coron. Milit. c. 11. Quos interdiu Exorcismis fugavit, noctibus defensabit. [4] Tertul. de Idol. c. 11. Quâ constantiâ exorcizabit Alumnos suos, quibus domum suam Cellariam præstat? [5] Vicecom. de Ritib. Bapt. lib. ii. c. 29. p. 302.
[6] Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. 25. n. 17.

their worship; for such men are a sort of foster-fathers to them. So that this passage, when rightly understood, makes nothing for the antiquity of exorcists, as a peculiar order of the clergy, but only shows in what sense every Christian is to be his own exorcist, viz. by his prayers, resisting the Devil, that he may fly from him.

SECT. 4.—Exorcists constituted into an Order in the latter End of the Third Century.

Setting aside, then, both that extraordinary power of exorcising, which was miraculous, and this ordinary way also, in which every man was his own exorcist, it remains to be inquired;—When the order of the exorcists was first settled in the Church? And here I take Bona's opinion to be the truest, "That it came in upon the withdrawing[1] of that extraordinary and miraculous power;" which probably was by degrees, and not at the same time in all places. Cornelius,[2] who lived in the third century, reckons exorcists among the inferior orders of the Church of Rome. Yet the author of the Constitutions, who lived after him, says,[3] "It was no certain order, but God bestowed the gift of exorcising as a free grace upon whom he pleased;" and therefore, consonant to that hypothesis, there is no rule among those Constitutions for giving any ordination to exorcists, as being appointed by God only, and not by the Church. But the credit of the Constitutions is not to be relied upon in this matter; for it is certain by this time exorcists were settled as an order in most parts of the Greek Church, as well as the Latin; which is evident from the council of Antioch, Anno 341, in one of whose canons[4] leave is given to the *Chorepiscopi* to promote subdeacons, readers, and exorcists; which argues, that those were then all standing orders of the Church. After this exorcists are frequently mentioned among the inferior orders by the writers of the fourth Century, as in the council[5] of Laodicea, Epiphanius,[6]

---

[1] Bona, ibid. Posteà subtractâ hâc Potestate, constituit Ecclesia Ordinem, qui Dæmonia expelleret. [2] Ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. [3] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 26. [4] Con. Antioch. c. 10. [5] Con. Laodic. c. 24 et 26. [6] Epiphan. Expos. Fid. n. 21.

Paulinus,[1] Sulpicius Severus,[2] and the Rescripts of Theodosius,[3] and Gratian[4] in the Theodosian Code, where those emperors grant them the same immunity from civil offices, as they do to the other orders of the clergy.

SECT. 5.—Their Ordination and Office.

Their ordination and office is thus described by the fourth council of Carthage:[5] "When an exorcist is ordained, he shall receive at the hands of the bishop a book, wherein the forms of exorcising are written, the bishop saying, 'Receive thou these, and commit them to memory, and have thou power to lay hands upon the energumens, whether they be baptized or only catechumens.'" Those forms were certain prayers, together with adjurations in the name of Christ, commanding the unclean spirit to depart out of the possessed person; which may be collected from the words of Paulinus, concerning the promotion of St. Felix to this office, where he says,[6] "From a reader he arose to that degree, whose office was to adjure Evil-Spirits, and to drive them out by certain holy words." It does not appear, that they were ordained to this office by any imposition of hands either in the Greek or Latin Church; but yet no one might pretend to exercise it either publicly or privately, in the Church or in any house, without the appointment of the bishop, as the council of Laodicea[7] directs; or at least the license of a *Chorepiscopus*, who in that case was authorized by the bishop's deputation.[8]

SECT. 6.—A short Account of the Energumens, their Names and Station in the Church.

As to the energumens, for whose sake this office was appointed, they were so called from the Greek word, Ἐνερ-

---

[1] Paulin. Natal. iv. S. Felicis. [2] Sulpic. Vit. S. Martin. c. 4. [3] Cod. Theod. lib. xii. tit. 1. de Decurion. leg. 121. [4] Ibid. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. Leg. 24. [5] Con. Carth. 4. c. 7. Exorcista quum ordinatur, accipiat de manu Episcopi libellum, in quo scripti sunt Exorcismi, dicente sibi Episcopo: "Accipe et commenda memoriæ, et habeto potestatem imponendi manus super Energumenum, siveBaptizatum, sive Catechumenum." [6] Paulin. Natal. 4. Felic. Primis Lector servivit in annis, inde gradum cepit, cui munus voce fideli adjurare malos, et sacris pellere verbis. [7] Con. Laod. c. 26. [8] Con. Antioch. c. 10.

γόμενοι, which in its largest signification denotes, *Persons who are under the motion and operation of any Spirit, whether good or bad;* but in a more restrained sense it is used by ecclesiastical writers for *persons whose bodies are seized or possessed with an evil-spirit.* Upon which account they are otherwise called Δαιμονιζόμενοι, *dæmoniacs,* and Κατεχόμενοι, *possessed.* And because this was frequently attended with great commotions and vexations, and disturbances of the body, occasioning sometimes phrenzy and madness, sometimes epileptic fits, and other violent tossings and contorsions; such persons are often upon that account styled Χειμαζόμενοι, by the Greek, and *Hyemantes,* by the Latin writers; that is, *tossed as in a winter-storm or tempest.* Thus the author of the Constitutions in some places[1] styles them simply Χειμαζόμενοι, by which that he means the energumens is evident, because in another place[2] he styles them Χειμαζόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆ ἀλλοτρίᾳ, *such as were under the commotions and vexations of Satan*; and tells us that prayer was made for them under that character, in the oblation at the Altar for all states and conditions of men, that God would deliver them from that violent energy or agitation of the wicked one. And thus most learned men, except Albaspinæus, understand that phrase in the canon of the council of Ancyra,[3] which orders some certain notorious sinners, "Εἰς τῆς χειμαζομένης εὔχεσθαι," *to pray in Loco Hyemantium,* in that part of the Church where the dæmoniacs stood, which was a place separate from all the rest. And some also think[4] the name, Κλυδωνιζόμενοι, was given to the energumens upon the same account, because it signifies persons agitated by a spirit, as a wave in a tempest.

SECT. 7.—The Exorcist chiefly concerned in the Care of them.

Now these energumens, or dæmoniacs, or whatever other name they were called by, were the persons about whom the exorcists were chiefly concerned. For besides the

[1] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 35 et 37. [2] Constit. lib. viii. c. 12. Παρακαλῶμέν σε ὑπὲρ τῶν χειμαζομένων ὑπο τῆ ἀλλοτρίᾳ—ὕπως καθαρίσῃς με τῆς ἐνεργείας τῆ πονηρῆ. [3] Con. Ancyr. c. 17. [4] Vid. Dodwel. Dissert. 1. in Cypr. n. 17.

ayers which were offered for them in all public assem-
ies, by the deacons and bishops, and the whole congre-
ition, (some forms of which prayers may be seen in the
ithor[1] of the Constitutions,) the exorcists were obliged to
ay over them at other times,[2] when there was no assembly
the Church; and to keep them employed in some inno-
ent business, as in sweeping[3] the Church and the like, to
revent more violent agitations of Satan, lest idleness
ould tempt the tempter; and to see them provided of daily[4]
od and sustenance, while they abode in the Church,
hich it seems was the chief place of their residence and
abitation.

SECT. 8.—The Duty of Exorcists in reference to the Catechumens.

This was the exorcists' office in reference to the energu-
ens; to which Valesius[5] and Gothofred[6] add another
fice, viz. that of exorcizing the catechumens before
aptism; which is a matter that will admit of some dispute.
or it does not appear always to have been the exorcists'
fice, save only in one of these two cases; either first
hen a catechumen was also an energumen, which was a
ase that very often happened; and then he was to be com-
itted to the care of the exorcists, whose office was to
orcize all energumens, whether they were baptized, or
ly catechumens, as is evident from the canon already
leged (sect. 5.) out of the council of Carthage. Or, se-
ndly, it might happen, that the exorcist was also made the
atechist, and in that case there can be no question, but
at his office was as well to exorcize, as to instruct the
atechumens. But then the catechist's office was many
mes separate from that of the exorcist's, (though some
odern writers confound them together); sometimes a pres-
yter, or a deacon, or a reader was the catechist; and in

---

[1] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 6. et 7. [2] Con. Carth. iv. c. 90. Omni
e Exorcistæ Energumenis manus imponant. [3] Ibid. c. 91. Pavi-
enta Domorum Dei Energumeni verrant. [4] Ibid. c. 92. Energume-
s in Domo Dei assidentibus victus quotidianus per Exorcistas opportuno
mpore ministretur. [5] Vales. Not. in Euseb. de Martyr. Palæstin. c. 2.
Gothofred. Not. in Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. leg. 24.

that case it seems more probable, that the exorcism of the catechumens was performed by the catechist, than by the exorcist; and for that reason I shall treat of the office of catechist distinctly in its proper place.

CHAP. V.

Of Lectors or Readers.

SECT. 1.—The Order of Readers not instituted till the Third Century.

IT is the opinion now of most learned men, even in the Romish Church, that there was no such order as that of readers distinct from others for at least two ages in the primitive Church. Bona[1] owns it to be one of the four orders, which he thinks only of ecclesiastical institution. And Cotelerius[2] says, there is no mention made of it before the time of Tertullian, who is the first author that speaks of it as a standing order in the Church: for writing against the heretics,[3] he objects to them, "That their orders were desultory and inconstant; a man was a deacon among them one day, and a reader the next:" which implies, that it was otherwise in the Church, and that readers then were as much a settled order as deacons, or any other. Cyprian, who lived not long after Tertullian, frequently speaks of them as an order of the clergy. In one[4] place he says, he had made one Saturus a reader; and in another place, he mentions one Aurelius, a confessor, whom he had ordained a reader for his singular merits, and constancy in time of persecution:[5] and for the same reason he made Celerinus, another confessor, one of the same order[6] among the clergy. So that it was then reckoned not only a clerical office, but an honourable office, to be a reader in the Church, and such

[1] Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. 25. n. 17. [2] Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 25. [3] Tertul. de Præscript. c. 41. Hodiè Diaconus, qui cras Lector. [4] Cypr. Ep. 24. al. 29. Fecisse me sciatis Lectorem Saturum. [5] Id. Ep. 33. al. 38. Merebatur Aurelius clericæ Ordinationis ulteriores gradus---Sed interim placuit ut ab Officio Lectionis incipiat, &c. [6] Id. Ep. 34. al. 39. Referimus ad vos, Celerinum—Clero nostro non humanâ suffragatione, sed divinâ Dignatione conjunctum, &c.

an one as a confessor needed not to be ashamed of. Sometimes persons of the greatest dignity were ordained to this office, as Julian is said to have been in the Church of Nicomedia[1] while he professed himself a Christian. Sozomen[2] says expressly, "that both he and his brother Gallus were reckoned among the clergy, and read the Scriptures publicly to the people." And there is no writer of that age, but always speaks of readers as a distinct order of the clergy in the Church.

SECT. 2.—By whom the Scriptures were read in the Church before the Institution of that Order.

But since the order of readers, though frequently spoken of in the third and fourth ages, are never once mentioned in the two first, it will be proper to inquire,—By whom the Scriptures were read in the Church for those two centuries? Mr. Basnage[3] is of opinion, that the Christian Church at first followed the example of the Jewish Church, and in this matter took her model from the Synagogue; where, as he observes out of Dr. Lightfoot,[4] the custom was, on every Sabbath-day, to have seven readers, first a priest, then a Levite, and after them five Israelites, such as the minister of the congregation, (whom they called the bishop or inspector and angel of the Church,) thought fit to call forth and nominate for that purpose. He thinks it was much after the same manner in the Christian Church; the office was not perpetually assigned to any particular man, but chiefly performed by presbyters and deacons, yet so as that any other might do it by the bishop's appointment. But indeed the matter is involved in so great obscurity, that no certain conjectures can be made from the writings of the two first ages; but all, that we can argue, is from the seeming remains of the ancient customs in the following ages. For since we find that deacons in many Churches continued to read the Gospel, even after the order of readers was

[1] Socrat. lib. iii. c. 1. Nazian. Invectiv. 1. tom. i. p. 58. [2] Sozom. lib. v. c. 2. Ὡς καὶ κλήρῳ ἐγκαταλεγῆναι, καὶ ὑπαναγινώσκειν τῷ λαῷ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς βίβλους. [3] Basnag. Exercit. in Baron. p. 623.
[4] Lightfoot Harm. p. 479.

set up, (as I have had occasion to show[1] in another place from the author[2] of the Constitutions, and St. Jerom,[3] and the council[4] of Vaison,) we may thence reasonably conclude, that this was part of their office before; and since presbyters and bishops in other Churches did the same, as Sozomen[5] informs us, it may as rationally be inferred, that this was their custom in former ages. But whether laymen performed this office at any time by the bishop's particular direction, as the Israelites did in the Jewish Church, cannot be so certainly determined. Only we find that in after ages, in the most celebrated Church of Alexandria, even the catechumens, as well as believers,[6] were admitted to do the office of readers; and that may incline a man to think, that this office was not wholly confined to the clergy in the two first ages. But this being peculiar to the Church of Alexandria, nothing can be argued from it concerning the practice of the Universal Church; and therefore till some better light is afforded, I leave this matter undetermined.

Sect. 3.—The Manner of Ordaining Readers.

It is more certain, that, after the order of readers was set up, it was generally computed among the orders of the clergy; except perhaps at Alexandria, where that singular custom prevailed of putting catechumens into the office. For it can hardly be supposed, that they reckoned persons that were unbaptized, and not yet allowed to partake of the holy mysteries, into the number of their clergy. But in all other places it was reputed a clerical order, and persons deputed to the office were ordained to it with the usual solemnities and ceremonies of the other inferior orders. In the Greek Church Habertus[7] thinks they were ordained with imposition of hands, but among the Latins without it. The author of the Constitutions prescribes a form of prayer to be used with imposition of hands; but whether that

---

[1] Book ii. chap. xx. sect. 6. [2] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57. [3] Hieron. Ep. 57. ad Sabin. [4] Con. Vasens. ii. c. 2. [5] Sozom. lib. vii. c. 19. [6] Socrat. lib. v. c. 22. Ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ δὲ Αλεξανδρείᾳ ἀναγνῶται ἢ ὑποβολεῖς ἀδιάφορον, εἴτε κατηχούμενοι εἰσὶν, εἴτε πιστοί. [7] Habert. Archieratic. par. 4. obs. i. p. 41.

the practice of all the Greek Church is very much tioned. In the Latin Church it was certainly other- . The council of Carthage[1] speaks of no other cere- y, but the bishop's putting the Bible into his hands in presence of the people, with these words: "Take this , and be thou a reader of the Word of God, which ɜ if thou fulfill faithfully and profitably, thou shalt have with those that minister in the Word of God." And in ian's time they seem not to have had so much as this nony of delivering the Bible to them, but they were ɜ readers by the bishop's commission, and deputation to such a station in the Church.

Sect. 4.—Their Station and Office in the Church.

ıis was the *pulpitum*, or *tribunal ecclesiæ*, as it is nonly called in Cyprian, *the reading-desk* in the body e Church, which was distinguished from the *bema* or *nal* of the sanctuary. For the reader's office was not ad the Scriptures at the altar, but in the reading-desk . Whence, "*Super pulpitum imponi*," and "*Ad itum venire*," are phrases in Cyprian[2] to denote the ıation of a reader. In this place, in Cyprian's time, read the Gospels, as well as other parts of Scripture; h is clear from one of Cyprian's Epistles;[3] where, king of Celerinus, the confessor, whom he had ordained ıder, he says, "it was fitting he should be advanced ıe pulpit or tribunal of the Church, that having the ntage of an higher station, he might thence read the epts and Gospels of his Lord, which he himself as a ageous confessor had followed and observed." Albas- [4] says, they also read the Epistles and Gospels in the

---

ɔn. Carth. iv. c. 8. Lector cùm ordinatur, faciat de illo verbum Epis- ad Plebem, indicans ejus Fidem, Vitam, et Ingenium. Post hæc spec- Plebe tradat ei Codicem, de quo lecturus est, dicens, "Accipe et esto r Verbi Dei, habiturus, si fideliter et utiliter impleveris officium, par- m eis qui Verbum Dei ministraverunt." [2] Cypr. Ep. 38 et 39. xon. [3] Cypr. Ep. 34. al. 39. Quid aliud quàm super Pulpitum, super Tribunal Ecclesiæ oportebat imponi, ut loci altioris celsitate tus----legat Præcepta et Evangelia Domini, quæ fortiter ac fideliter ur? [4] Albaspin. Not. in Con. Carth. iii. can. 4.

communion-service; but he should first have proved, that those were anciently any part of the communion-service. For they do not appear to have been so from the most ancient Liturgies, but were only read in the *Missa Catechumenorum*, or as we now call it, *the first service*, at which the catechumens were present: and wheresoever they were taken into the communion-service, it was the office of deacons, and not the readers, to rehearse them. But of this more when we come to the Liturgy and Service of the ancient Church.

SECT. 5.—The Age at which they might be Ordained.

There is but one thing more to be noted concerning this order, which is the age at which readers might be ordained. That is fixed by one of Justinian's Novels,[1] precisely forbidding any one to be ordained reader before he was completely eighteen years old. But, before this law was made, it was customary to ordain them much younger; for Ennodius, bishop of Ticinum, says of Epiphanius, his predecessor,[2] that he was ordained reader at eight years old; as Cæsarius Arelatensis[3] is said to have been at seven. And this leads us to understand what Sidonius Apollinaris means, when speaking of John, bishop of Chalons, he says, "he was a reader[4] from his infancy." Which is also said of St. Felix by Paulinus,[5] "that he served in the office of a reader from his tender years." So Victor Uticensis, describing the barbarity of the Vandalic persecution in Afric, aggravates their cruelty with this circumstance, "that they had murdered or famished all the clergy of Carthage, five hundred or more, among whom[6] there were many infant readers." Now the reason why persons were ordained so young to this office, was what I have intimated before, that

[1] Justin. Novel. 123. c. 54. [2] Ennod. Vit. Epiphan. Bibl. Patr. tom. xv. p. 295. Annorum fermè octo Lectoris Ecclesiastici suscipit officium. [3] Vit. Cæsar. ap. Sur. 27. Aug. Clero adscriptum inter ipsa infantiæ rudimenta, post exactum ætatis septennium. [4] Sidon. lib. iv. Ep. 26. Lector hic primum, sic minister altaris, idque ab infantiâ. [5] Paulin. Natal. 4. Felic. Primis Lector servivit in annis. [6] Victor. de Persec. Vandal. lib. iii. Bibl. Patr. tom. vii. 613. Ferè quingenti vel amplius, inter quos quamplurimi erant Lectores infantuli, &c.

parents sometimes dedicated their children to the service of God from their infancy, and then they were trained up and disciplined in some inferior offices, that they might be qualified and rendered more expert for the greater services of the Church.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Ostiarii or Doorkeepers.

SECT. 1.—No mention of this Order till the Third or Fourth Century.

THIS is the last of those five orders, which are pretended by the present Church of Rome to be of apostolical institution: but for three whole centuries we never so much as meet with the name of it in any ancient writer, except in the epistle of Cornelius,[1] bishop of Rome, where the Πυλωροὶ, or *door-keepers*, are mentioned with the rest. In Cyprian and Tertullian there is no mention of them. The first and lowest order with them is that of readers, as it is now in the Greek Church, among whom the order of door-keepers has been laid aside from the time of the council of Trullo, Anno 692, as Schelstrate[2] scruples not to confess, though he blames Morinus for being a little too frank and liberal in extending this concession to the apostolical ages; and in order to confute him alleges the authority of Ignatius and Clemens Romanus[3] for the antiquity of this order. But he refers us only to spurious treatises under their names, not known till the fourth century, about which time it is owned this order began to be spoken of by some few Greek writers. For Epiphanius[4] and the council of Laodicea[5] put the Θυρωροὶ, that is, *door-keepers*, among the other orders of the clergy: and Justinian also, in one of his Novels,[6] speaks of them as settled in the great Church of Constantinople, where he limits their number to one hundred, for the use of that and three other Churches. This

[1] Ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. [2] Schelstrat. Con. Antioch. Dissert, iv. c. 17. p. 590. [3] Ignat. Ep. ad Antioch, et Clement. Constit. lib. iii. c. 11. [4] Epiphan. Expos. Fid. n. 21. [5] Con. Laodic. c. 24. [6] Just. Novel. iii. c. 1. Insuper centum existentibus, qui vocantur Ostiarii.

proves that they were settled in some parts of the Greek Church, though, as Habertus observes,[1] they continued not many ages, nor ever universally obtained an establishment in all Churches.

Sect. 2.—The Manner of their Ordination in the Latin Church.

What sort of ordination they had in the Greek Church we do not find; for there is no author that speaks of it. In the Latin Church it was no more but the bishop's commission, with the ceremony of delivering the keys of the Church into their hands, and saying, "Behave thyself as one that must give an account to God of the things that are kept locked under these keys;" as the form is[2] in the fourth council of Carthage, and the *Ordo Romanus*,[3] and Gratian,[4] who have it from that council.

Sect. 3.—Their Office and Function.

Their office is commonly said to consist in taking care of the doors of the Church in time of divine service, and in making a distinction betwixt the faithful, and the catechumens, and excommuniated persons, and such others as were to be excluded from the Church. But I confess this is more than can be made out from ancient history, at least in reference to the state and discipline of many Churches. For in the African Church particularly, as I shall have occasion to show in another place, a liberty was given, not only to catechumens and penitents, but also to heretics, Jews, and heathens, to come to the first part of the Church's service, called the *Missa Catechumenorum*, that is, to hear the Scripture read, and the homily or sermon that was made upon it; because these were instructive, and might be means of their conversion, so that there was no need of making any distinction here. Then for the other part of the service, called *Missa Fidelium*, or the *communion-service*, the distinction, that was made in that, was

[1] Habert. Archieratic par. 5. obs. 1. p. 47. [2] Con. Carth. 4. c. 9. Ostiarius cùm ordinatur—ad suggestionem Archidiaconi tradat ei Episcopus claves Ecclesiæ, dicens; "Sic age quasi reddituruus Deo rationem de his rebus quæ his clavibus recluduntur." [3] Ordo Roman. part. 2. p. 98. [4] Grat. Dist. 23. c. 19.

ne by the deacons or subdeacons, and deaconesses, as I ve showed before in speaking of those orders. So that that the door-keepers could have to do in this matter s only to open and shut the doors, as officers and serents under the others, and to be governed wholly by their ection. It belonged to them likewise to give notice of e times of prayer and Church-assemblies; which, in time persecution, required a private signal, for fear of discory: and that, perhaps, was the first reason of instituting s order in the Church of Rome, whose example by dees was followed by other Churches. However it be, eir office and station seems to have been little more than at of clerks and sextons in our modern Churches.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Psalmistæ or Singers.

CT. 1.—The Singers a Distinct Order from Readers in the ancient Church.

I HAVE hitherto given an account of those five inferior ders, which the Church of Rome has singled out from e rest, and without any reason stamped them with the thority and character of apostolical institution; whilst t she takes no notice of some others, which have as good etence to antiquity, and to be styled distinct clerical orrs, as most of the former. Among these I reckon the *salmistæ*, the *Copiatæ*, and the *Parabolani* of the primie Church. Habertus[1] and Bellarmin,[2] and others, who e concerned to maintain the credit of the Romish Church making but five inferior orders, pretend that singers and aders are only one and the same order. But as the monists of their own Church generally reckon them two, nothing can be more evident than that they were always counted so in the primitive Church from their first institution. For they are distinguished, as much as any other ders, by all the writers that mention them; as the reader, at is curious in this matter, may satisfy himself by con-

[1] Habert. Archierat. par. 4. obs. 4. p. 44.

[2] Bellarm. de Clericis, i. c. 11.

sulting the places of Ephrem Syrus,[1] the council of Laodicea,[2] and those called the Apostolical Canons,[3] and Constitutions,[4] the author[5] of St. Mark's Liturgy, the Epistle under the name of Ignatius,[6] Justinian,[7] and the council of Trullo,[8] referred to in the margin. Particularly Justinian's Novel does so distinguish them, as to inform us, that there were twenty-five singers, and one hundred and ten readers in the Greek Church of Constantinople; which is a convincing evidence that they were of different orders.

Sect. 2.—Their Institution and Office.

The first rise and institution of these singers, as an order of the clergy, seems to have been about the beginning of the fourth century. For the council of Laodicea is the first that mentions them, unless any one thinks perhaps the Apostolical Canons to be a little more ancient. The reason of instituting them seems to have been to regulate and encourage the ancient psalmody of the Church. For from the first and apostolical age singing was always a part of divine service, in which the whole body of the Church joined together: which is a thing so evident, that though Cabassutius[9] denies it, and in his spite to the Reformed Churches, where it is generally practised, calls it only a protestant whim; yet Cardinal Bona has more than once[10] not only confessed, but solidly proved it to have been the primitive practice. Of which therefore I shall say no more at present, but only observe, that it was the decay of this that first brought the order of singers into the Church. For when it was found by experience, that the negligence and unskilfulness of the people rendered them unfit to perform this service, without some more curious and skilful to guide and assist them; then a peculiar order of men were appointed, and set over this business, with a design to retrieve and improve the ancient psalmody, and not to abolish or

---

[1] Ephrem. 93. Serm. de Secundo Dom. Advent. [2] Con. Laodic. can. 24. [3] Can. Apost. c. 69 et 43. [4] Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. 11. [5] Liturg. Marci. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. tom. ii. p. 85. [6] Epist. ad Antiochen. [7] Justin. Novel. 3. c. 1. [8] Con. Trull. c. 4. [9] Cabassut. Notit. Con. c. 38. p. 201. [10] Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. 25. n. 19. It. de Divin. Psalmod. c. 17.

destroy it. And from this time these were called Κανονικοὶ Ψαλται, *the canonical singers*, that is, such as were entered into the canon or catalogue of the clergy, which distinguished them from the body of the Church. In some places it was thought fit for some time to prohibit all others from singing but only these; with design, no doubt, to restore the concent of the ancient ecclesiastical harmony; which otherwise could not well have been done, but by obliging the rest for some time to be silent, and learn of those, who were more skilful in the art of music. Thus I understand that canon of the council of Laodicea,[1] which forbids all others to sing in the Church, except only the canonical singers, who went up into the *ambo*, or *singing-desk*, and sung out of a book. This was a temporary provision, designed only to restore and revive the ancient psalmody, by reducing it to its primitive harmony and perfection. That, which the rather inclines me to put this sense upon the canon, and look upon it only as a prohibition for a time, is, that in after ages we find the people enjoyed their ancient privilege of singing all together; which is frequently mentioned by St. Austin, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Basil, and many others, who give an account of the psalmody and service of the Church in their own ages; of which I shall speak more hereafter in its proper place.

Sect. 3.—Why called Ὑποβολεῖς.

Here I must note, that these canonical singers were also called Ὑποβολεῖς, *monitors*, or *suggestors*, from their office, which was to be a sort of precentors to the people; for the custom in some places was for the singer or psalmist to begin a psalm or hymn, and sing half a verse by himself, and then the people answered in the latter clause; and from this they were said "ὑπηχεῖν," or "*succinere*," *to sing after him*, by way of *Antiphona*, or responsal. In this sense Epiphanius Scholasticus understands the name Ὑποβολεῖς in Socrates,[2] for he translates it, *Psalmi Pronunciatores;*

[1] Con. Laodic. c. 15. Μὴ δεῖν πλέον τῶν κανονικῶν ψαλτῶν τῶν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄμβωνα ἀναβαινόντων, ἢ ἀπὸ διφθέρας ψαλλόντων, ἑτέρους τινὰς ψάλλειν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ. [2] Socrat. lib. v. c. 22.

and so both Valesius[1] and Cotelerius[2] explain it. But Habertus is of the contrary mind: he thinks[3] the name, Ὑποβολεῖς, denotes not singers, but readers; and that they were so called, because they *suggested* to the preachers a portion of Scripture to discourse upon: for then their homilies were frequently upon such parts of Scripture, as the reader had just before repeated. The controversy is nice betwixt these learned men, and I shall no further inquire into the merits of it, but leave it to every judicious reader to determine.

SECT. 4.—What sort of Ordination they had.

There is but one thing more, that needs be noted, concerning this order, which is the manner of their designation to this office; which in this agreed with all the other inferior orders, that it required no imposition of hands, or solemn consecration. But in one thing it differed from them;—That, whereas the rest were usually conferred by the bishop or a *Chorepiscopus*, this might be conferred by a presbyter, using this form of words, as it is in the canon of the fourth council of Carthage,[4] "See that thou believe in thy heart what thou singest with thy mouth, and approve in thy works what thou believest in thy heart." And this is all the ceremony we find any where used about their designation.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Copiatæ or Fossarii.

SECT. 1.—The *Copiatæ* or *Fossarii* reckoned among the *Clerici* of the Primitive Church.

ANOTHER order of the inferior clergy in the primitive Church were those, whose business was to take care of

[1] Vales. in Socrat. ibid. [2] Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57. [3] Habert. Archierat. par. iv. obs. i. p. 39. [4] Con. Carth. iv. c. 10. Psalmista, id est, Cantor potest absque scientiâ episcopi, solâ jussione Presbyteri, officium suscipere cantandi, dicente sibi Presbytero: vide ut, quod ore cantas, corde credas: et quod corde credis, operibus comprobes.

merals, and provide for the decent interment of the dead. These in ancient writers are commonly termed *Copiatæ*, which is the name that Constantius gives them in two Rescripts in the Theodosian Code.[1] Epiphanius[2] speaks of them under the same name, styling them Κοπιάται, and the author[3] under the name of Ignatius, Κοπιῶντες. Gothofred[4] deduces it from the Greek word κοπάζειν, which signifies *resting*; others from κοπετὸς, *mourning*; but generally the name is thought to be given them from κόπος and κοπιᾶσθαι, which signify *labouring*; whence they are by some called *Laborantes*. The author under the name of St. Jerom[5] styles them *Fossarii*, from digging of graves; and in Justinian's Novels[6] they are called *Lecticarii*, from carrying the corps or bier at funerals. Gothofred thinks it improper to reckon these among the *Clerici*[7] of the ancient Church. But when we are speaking of things and customs of the ancient Church, I know not how we shall speak more properly than in the language of the ancients, who themselves call them so. For not only the author[8] under the name of St. Jerom calls them the first order of the *Clerici*, as they are in his account, but St. Jerom himself also gives them the same title; speaking of one that was to be interred, "The *Clerici*," says he, "whose office[9] it was, wound up the body, digged the earth, builded a vault, and so, according to custom, made ready the grave." This is the reason why Epiphanius[10] and the counterfeit Ignatius reckon them among the inferior orders. And Gothofred had no need to make emendations upon those imperial laws[11] in the Theo-

---

[1] Cod. Theod. lib. xiii. tit. 1. de Lustrali Collat. leg. 1. It lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 15. [2] Epiphan. Expos. Fid. n. 21. [3] Epist. ad Antioch. n. 12. [4] Gothofred. Com. in. Cod. Theod. lib. xiii. tit. 1. leg. 1. [5] Hieron. de Sept. Ordin. Eccles. tom. iv. p. 81. [6] Justin. Novel. 43 et 59. [7] Gothofred. Not. in Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 2. leg. 15. [8] De Sept. Ordin. Eccles. Primus in Clericis Fossariorum Ordo est, &c. [9] Hieron. Ep. ad Innocent. De Muliere septies ictâ. tom. i. p. 235. Clerici, quibus id officii erat, cruentum linteo cadaver obvolvunt, et ossam humum lapidibus construentes, ex more tumulum parant.
[10] Epiphan. et Ignat. ubi suprà. [11] Cod. Theod. lib. vii. tit. 20. De Veteranis. leg. 12. Dum se quidam vocabulo Clericorum, et infaustis defunctorum obsequiis occupatos—defendunt. &c. Ibid. lib. xiii. tit. 1. De Lustrali Collat. leg. 1. Clericos excipi tantùm, qui Copiatæ appellantur, &c. Ibid. lib. xvi. tit. 2. De Episc. leg. 15. Clerici verò, vel hi, quos Copiatas veteres usus instituit nuncupari, &c.

dosian Code, which give the *Copiatæ* the name of *Clerici*, and entitle them to some immunities and privileges upon that account; for this, as appears, was only to speak in the language and style of other ecclesiastical writers.

SECT. 2.—First instituted in the Time of Constantine.

This order seems to have been first instituted in the time of Constantine; for Constantius, his son, in one of those laws just now referred to, speaks of it as a late institution, and there is no writer of the three first ages that ever mentions it: but all that time the care of interring the dead was only a charitable office, which every Christian thought himself obliged to perform as occasion required. And that is the reason, why we meet with so many noble encomiums of this sort of charity in the writers of those ages, but never once mention of any order instituted for that purpose. But when Constantine came to the throne, and was quietly settled in his new seat at Constantinople, he incorporated a body of men, to the number of eleven hundred, in that city, under the name of *Copiatæ*, for that particular service; and so they continued to the time of Honorius and Theodosius Junior, who reduced them[1] to nine hundred and fifty. But Anastatius augmented them again to the first number, which Justinian confirmed by two Novels,[2] published for that purpose. And I suppose from this example of the Constantinopolitan Church they took their rise in other populous Churches.

SECT. 3.—Why called *Decani* and *Collegiati*.

But probably there might be some little difference between those in the Church of Constantinople and others in the lesser Churches. For at Constantinople they were incorporated into a sort of civil society, in the Roman language called *collegium*, *a college*; whence the laws sometimes styled them *collegiati*, and *decani*, *collegiates*, and *deans*. As in the fore-mentioned laws of Honorius and Theodosius Junior, and Justinian, and another of Theodo-

[1] Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 2. De SS. Eccles. leg. 4. Non plures quàm nongenti quinquaginta Decani deputentur Ecclesiæ, &c. [2] Justin. Novel. 43 et 59.

ius the Great,[1] in the Justinian Code, where he grants hem an exemption from some other civil offices, provided hey did not act upon a feigned and pretended title, but vere really employed in the service of the Church. But vhy they were called *Decani*, is not very easy to conjecture. Propably it might be, because they resembled the palatine leans, who were a sort of military officers belonging to the emperor's palace, and are styled also *Corpus Decanorum* in both the Codes[2] mentioned by St. Chrysostom,[3] and other Greek writers, under the name of Δεκανοὶ ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις, *leans of the palace*, to distinguish them from those other leans of the Church, which some unwarily confound together. But I am not very confident that this was the eason of the name, and therefore I only propose it as a onjecture, till some one assigns a better reason for it.

Sect. 4.—Their Office and Privileges.

Their office was to take the whole care of funerals upon themselves, and to see, that all persons had a decent and honourable interment. Especially they were obliged to perform this last office to the poorer sort, without exacting any thing of their relations upon that account. That it was so at Constantinople, appears from one of Justinian's Novels,[4] which acquaints us, how Anastatius, the emperor, settled certain revenues of land upon this society, and ordered a certain number of shops or workhouses in the city to be freed from all manner of tribute, and to be appropriated to this use; out of whose income and annual rents of the lands, the defensors and stewards of the Church, who had the chief care and oversight of the matter, were to pay these deans, and see the expenses of such funerals defrayed. Justinian not only confirmed that settlement, but a complaint being made of an abuse—that, notwithstanding the laws of Anastatius, pay was exacted for funerals,—he pub-

[1] Cod. Just. lib. xi. tit. 17. De Collegiatis. leg. unic. Qui sub prætextu Decanorum seu Collegiatorum, cùm id munus non impleant, aliis se muneribus conantur subtrahere, eorum fraudibus credimus esse obviandum. [2] Vid. Cod. Theod. lib. vi. tit. 33. de Decanis. leg. 1. It. Cod. Just. lib. xii. tit. 27. leg. 1 et 2. [3] Chrys. Hom. 13. in Hebr. p. 1849.
[4] Justin. Novel. 59.

lished that, his Novel, on purpose to correct it. But we do not find that such settlements were made in all other Churches; but it is more probable, that the *Copiatæ* were maintained partly out of the common stock of the Church, and partly out of their own labour and traffic, which, for their encouragement, was generally exempted from paying custom or tribute, as we shall see hereafter.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Parabolani.

SECT. 1.—The *Parabolani* ranked by some among the *Clerici*.

ANOTHER order of men, which by some are reckoned among the *Clerici* of the ancient Church, were those, whom they called *Parabolani*. Theodosius Junior, in one of his laws relating to them in the Theodosian Code,[1] puts them among the *Clerici*, and evidently includes them under that common title, as Gothofred rightly observes in his exposition of the place. Baronius himself does not deny that they were of the clergy, but he would persuade his reader, that they were not a distinct order, but chosen out of the inferior orders of the clergy,[2] of which there is nothing said in that law, but rather the contrary, that they were to be chosen out of the poor of Alexandria.

SECT. 2.—Their Institution and Office.

Their office is described in the next law, where they are said to be deputed to attend upon the sick, and to take care of their bodies in time of their weakness.[3] At Alexandria they were incorporated into a society to the number of five

[1] Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. ii. de Episc. leg. 42. Placet nostræ Clementiæ, ut nihil commune Clerici cum publicis Actibus vel ad curiam pertinentibus habeant. Gothofr. Not. in Loc. Sane Clericorum eos numero fuisse, tum hujus Legis initium, tum utraque hæc Lex et sequens ostendunt. [2] Baron. an. 416. tom. iv. p. 400. Fuisse hos minoris ordinis Clericos allectos, exordium dati hoc anno Rescripti insinuare videtur. [3] Cod. Theod. Ibid. leg. 43. Parabolani, qui ad curanda debilium ægra corpora deputantur, quingentos esse ante præcepimus: sed quia hos minus sufficere in præsenti cognovimus, pro quingeotis sexcentos constitui præcipimus, &c.

or six hundred, to be chosen, at the discretion of the bishop of the place, out of any sort of men except the *honorati* and *curiales*, who were tied to serve in the civil offices of their country, and therefore were not allowed to enter themselves into any ecclesiastical service. They were to be under the government and direction of the bishop, as appears from the same law, which is a correction of the former law; for by it they were put under the government of the *Præfectus Augustalis*, as the chief civil magistrate was called at Alexandria. But by this law Theodosius revoked his former decree, and subjected them entirely to the care and disposition of the bishop, or, as the Greek collector of the Ecclesiastical Constitutions out of the civil law[1] styles him, the pope; meaning, not the pope of Rome, as some ignorantly mistake, but the pope or bishop of Alexandria. For then it was customary to give every bishop the name of *Papa*, as has been showed in another place.[2] What time this order began, we cannot certainly determine. The first notice we have of it is in these Laws of Theodosius Junior, Anno 415. Yet it is not there spoken of as newly instituted, but as settled in the Church before; and probably it might be instituted about the same time, as the *Copiatæ* were under Constantine, when some charitable offices, which were only voluntarily practised by Christians before, as every one's piety inclined him, were now turned into standing offices, and settled upon a certain order of men particularly devoted to such services. That it was not any order peculiar to the Church of Alexandria, is evident, because there is mention made of the *Parabalani* being at Ephesus in the time of the second council, that was held there, Anno 449. For Basilius Seleuciensis, who subscribed there to the condemnation of Flavian and the absolution of Eutyches, the heretic, being brought to a recantation in the council of Chalcedon, makes this apology for himself, "that he was terrified into that subscription, by the soldiers that came armed into the Church, together with Barsumus and his monks, and the *Parabalani*,[3] and a great multitude of

[1] Collect. Constit. Eccles. lib. i. tit. 3. c. 18. [2] Book ii. chap. ii. sect. 7. [3] Con. Chalced. Act. i. tom. iv. p. 252.

others." The original word is Παραβαλανεῖς; which the old translator rightly renders, *Parabalani*, which is the same with *Parabolani*, for it is written both ways in ancient authors. But Binius, in his Greek edition of the Councils, not understanding the word, explains it, "*ii qui circa balnea versantur*," as if the *Parabalani* had been persons attending at the public baths; whereas now all men know their office was of a different nature, and their names given them for a reason very different from that of giving attendance at the baths.

SECT. 3.—The Reason of the Name *Parabolani*.

As to the reason of their name, to omit the fanciful interpretations of Alciat and Accursius, which are sufficiently exposed by Gothofred, the opinion of Duarenus,[1] and Gothofred seems to be the truest, that they were called *Parabolani* from their undertaking "Παράβολον ἔργον," a most dangerous and hazardous office, in attending the sick, especially in infections and pestilential diseases. The Greeks were used to call those Παράβολοι, who hired themselves out to fight with wild beasts in the amphitheatre. And so Socrates, the historian,[2] uses the word; speaking of Theodosius's exhibiting one of the public games to the people at Constantinople, he says, "the people cried out to him that he should suffer one of the bold Παράβολοι to fight with the wild beasts." These were those, whom the Romans called *Bestiarii*, and sometimes *Paraboli* and *Parabolarii*, from the Greek word Παραβάλλεσθαι, which signifies exposing a man's life to danger, as they that fought with wild beasts did. In this sense, I have had occasion to show[3] before, the Christians were generally called *Parabolarii* by the Heathens, because they were so ready to expose their lives to martyrdom. And it is the opinion of Gothofred[4] and some other[5] learned critics, that the ancient reading of the Greek copies of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians,

---

[1] Duaren. De Minist. et Benefic. lib. i. c. 19. [2] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 22. Ὁ δῆμος κατεβόα, δεινῷ θηρίῳ ἕνα τῶν ἐνηφυῶν παραβόλων μάχεσθαι.
[3] Book i. chap. ii. sect. 9. [4] Gothofr. Not. in Cod. Th. xvi. t. 12.
[5] Vid. Grot. Hammond. Capel. in Philip. 2. 30.

p. ii. ver. 30, was "Παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ," exposing life to danger, as an old Latin interpreter of Puteanus lers it, "*Parabolatus de animâ suâ.*" In the same se these *Parabolani* of the primitive Church, we are now iking of, had their name from their boldly exposing their ı to danger in attendance upon the sick in all infectious pestilential distempers.

SECT. 4.—Some Laws and Rules concerning their Behaviour.

shall only observe further of them, that being commonly, ›rding to their name, men of a bold and daring spirit, were ready upon all occasions to engage in any quar- hat should happen in Church or State. As they seem ave done in the dispute between Cyril, the bishop, and stes, the governor of Alexandria; which was the reason, Theodosius, by his first law, sunk their number to hundred, and put them under the inspection of the *rfectus Augustalis*, and strictly prohibited them from earing at any public shows, or in the common council ıe city, or in the judge's court, unless any of them had use of his own, or of the whole body, as their syndic, rosecute there; and then he must appear single without of his order or associates to abet him. And though not long after revoked this law as to the former part, wing them to be six hundred, and the bishop to have choice and cognizance of them; yet in all other respects ›rdered it to stand in its full force, still prohibiting them ppear in a body upon any of the foresaid[1] occasions. Justinian made this law perpetual by inserting it into own Code; which shows, that the civil government ıys looked upon these *Parabolani* as a formidable body ıen, and accordingly kept a watchful eye and strict l over them: that, whilst they were serving the Church, might not do any disservice to the State, but keep in the bounds of that office, whereto they were ap- ted.

›d, Just. lib. i. tit. 3. De Episc. leg. 18. Hi sexcenti viri reverendissi- cerdotis præceptis ac dispositionibus obsecundent; reliquis, quæ dudum egis forma complectitur super his Parabolanis, vel de spectaculis, vel iciis, cæterisque (sicut jam statutum est) custodiendis.

CHAP. X.

Of the Catechists.

SECT. I.—Catechists no distinct Order of the Clergy, but chosen out of any other Order.

I have hitherto discoursed of such particular orders of the ecclesiastics in the primitive Church, as were destinated precisely to some particular office and function: but there were some offices which did not require a man to be of any one distinct order, but might be performed by persons of any order; and it will be necessary I should give some account of these also, whilst I am treating of the clergy of the Church. The first of these I shall speak of is the catechist, whose office was to instruct the catechumens in the first principles of religion, and thereby prepare them for the reception of baptism. This office was sometimes done by the bishop himself, as is evident from that passage in St. Ambrose, where he says,[1] "Upon a certain Lord's-Day, after the reading the Scriptures and the sermon, when the catechumens were dismissed, he took the *Competentes*, or candidates for baptism, into the baptistery of the Church, and there rehearsed the creed to them." This was on Palm-Sunday, when it was customary for the bishop himself to catechize such of the catechumens as were to be baptized on Easter-Eve. Theodorus Lector[2] takes notice of the same custom in the eastern Churches, when he tells us, "that before the time of Timothy, bishop of Constantinople, the Nicene Creed was never used to be repeated publicly in that Church, except only once a year, on the great day of preparation, the day of our Lord's passion, when the bishop was wont to catechise." At other times presbyters and deacons were the catechists. St. Chrysostom performed this office, when he was presbyter of Antioch, as

---

[1] Ambros. Ep. 33. Post Lectiones atque Tractatum, dimissis Catechumenis, Symbolum aliquibus Competentibus in Baptisteriis tradebam Basilicæ.
[2] Theodor. Lector. Collectan. lib. ii. p. 563. Τὸ σύμβολον ἅπαξ τοῦ ἔτους λεγόμενον πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ παρασχευῇ τοῦ θείου πάθους, τῷ καιρῷ τῶν γινόμενων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου κατηχήσεων.

appears from one of his Homilies,[1] which is inscribed, Κατήχησις πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας φωτίζεσθαι, *A catechism or instruction for the candidates of baptism.* Deogratias was catechist when he was deacon of Carthage; as we learn from St. Austin's book,[2] *De Catechizandis Rudibus*, which he wrote at his request, to give him some assistance in performing his duty.

SECT. 2.—Readers sometimes made Catechists.

Nor was it only the superior orders that performed this office; but sometimes persons were chosen out of the inferior orders to do it. Optatus was but a reader in the Church of Carthage, and yet Cyprian made him catechist, or as it is in his phrase,[3] "*Doctor Audientium*,"—*the master of the hearers*, or lowest rank of catechumens. Origen seems to have had no higher degree in the Church, when he was first made catechist at Alexandria; for both Eusebius[4] and St. Jerom[5] say, he was but eighteen years old, when he was deputed to that office; which was at least seven years before he could be ordained deacon by the Canons of the Church.

SECT. 3.—Why called Ναυτολόγοι by some Greek Writers.

The author under the name of Clemens Romanus seems to have had regard to this, when comparing the Church to a ship, and the clergy to the officers in it, he plainly distinguishes the catechists from the bishop, presbyters, and deacons, saying, "The bishop[6] is to resemble the Πρωρεύς, or *Pilot;* the presbyters the Ναῦται, or *mariners;* the deacons the Τοίχαρχοι, or *chief rowers;* the catechists the Ναυτολόγοι, or those whose office it was to admit passengers into the ship, and contract with them for *the fare of their passage.* This was properly the catechist's duty, to

---

[1] Chrys. Hom. 21. ad Popul. Antiochen. [2] Aug. de Catechizand. Rudibus. c. 1. tom. iv. p. 295. Dixisti quod sæpe apud Carthaginem, ubi Diaconus es, ad te adducantur, qui fide Christiana imbuendi sunt, &c.
[3] Cypr. Ep. 24. al. 29. Optatum inter Lectores Doctorem Audientium constituimus. [4] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 3. [5] Hieron. de Scriptor. in Origine. Decimo octavo ætatis suæ anno κατηχήσεων opus aggressus, &c.
[6] Clem. Ep. ad Jacob. n. 14.

show the catechumens the contract they were to make, and the conditions they were to perform, viz. repentance, faith, and new obedience, in order to their admittance into the Christian ship, the Church, in which they were to pass through this world to the Kingdom of Heaven. Upon this account the catechists were termed Ναυτολόγοι, and as such distinguished from bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Cotelerius[1] says he found a Greek MS. in one of the French King's libraries, where the same comparison is made, and cited out of the Constitutions, in these words: "The Church is like a ship; Christ is the governor; the bishop, the pilot; the presbyters, the mariners; the deacons, the chief rowers; the catechists, or *Nautologi*, the orders of subdeacons and readers." So that it is evident the catechists were sometimes chosen out of the inferior orders, when any of them were found duly qualified to discharge the duties of that function. And this will be the less wondered at by any one that considers, that the deaconesses, whilst their order was in being, were required to be a sort of private catechists to the more ignorant and rustic women catechumens; which I need not stand to evince here, because I have done it heretofore in speaking of the offices, which belonged to that order. See book ii. chap. 22. sect. 9.

Sect. 4.—Whether all Catechists taught publicly in the Church.

But in all these cases there is one thing to be diligently noted,—that this sort of catechists were not allowed to instruct their catechumens publicly in the Church, but only in private auditories appointed particularly for that purpose. Valesius[2] observes this in the case of Origen, and rightly concludes it from the Invective of Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, against Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus, bishop of Cæsarea, who had authorized Origen

---

[1] Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57. p. 263. Ἔοικεν ἡ ἐκκλησία νηΐ ὁ μὲν κυβερνήτης ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός. ὁ δὲ πρωρεὺς, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος. οἱ ναῦται, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. οἱ τοίχαρχοι, οἱ διάκονοι. οἱ ναυτολόγοι, τὸ τῶν ἀναγνωστῶν καὶ ὑπηρετῶν τάγμα. [2] Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. vi. c. 19. It. Hallier. de Hierarch. Eccles. lib. i. c. 7. p. 66.

preach publicly in the Church, when as yet he was no esbyter. This accusation had been ridiculous, had he nself given Origen the same power before, when he was techist at eighteen years of age, at Alexandria. Ruffin, leed, in his Translation of Eusebius, says positively, hat Demetrius gave him authority to catechise and teach blicly in the Church."[1] But that is an interpolation and se paraphrase of Eusebius's words, who says no such ng, but only,[2] "that Demetrius, bishop of the Church, d committed to his care the office of catechizing," or (as may render it,) "the catechetic school," where probably some time he also taught grammar, and other human rning. That there were such sort of catechetic schools joining to the Church in many places, is evident from a vel[3] of the Emperor Leo, who calls them "Κατηχούμενα," d says, "they were a sort of buildings belonging to the urch." It might be the baptistry, as St. Ambrose calls or any other places set apart for that purpose.

SECT. 5.—Of the Succession in the Catechetic School at Alexandria.

Such a school as this we may suppose that to have been, erein Origen and so many other famous men read cateetic lectures at Alexandria. Eusebius[4] says, "Pantænus ight in this school, Anno 181; and that it was a school of cred learning from ancient custom long before, and that continued so to be to his own time." St. Jerom deduces original from St. Mark, the first founder of the Church of exandria, telling us, "that Pantænus[5] taught Christian ilosophy at Alexandria, where it had been the custom of l always to have ecclesiastical doctors from the time of

---

Ruffin. lib. vi. c. 3. Demetrius - - - Catechizandi ei, id est, docendi gisterium in Ecclesiâ tribuit. [2] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 3. Ἀυτῷ μόνῳ τῦ κατηχεῖν διατριβῆς ὑπὸ Δημητρίυ τῦ της ἐκκλησίας προεςῶτος ἐπιτεμμένης. [3] Leo. Novel. 73. In Ecclesiarum Cœnaculis, quæ promism vulgus κατηχούμενα vocare solet. Vid. Con. Trull. c. 97. Balsamon. ar. in Loc. [4] Euseb. lib. v. c. 10. Ἡγεῖτο τηνικαῦτα της τῶν ῶν ἀυτόθι διατριβῆς Πάνταινος· ἐξ ἀρχαίυ ἔθυς διδασκαλείυ τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων ὁ αὐτοῖς συνεςῶτος· ὁ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς παρατείνεται. [5] Hieron. de Scrip c. 36. Pantænus Stoicæ Sectæ Philosophus, juxta quandum Veterum in xandria consuetudinem, ubi à Marco Evangelistâ semper Ecclesiastici re Doctores - - - Docuit sub Severo Principe, &c.

St. Mark." Where, by ecclesiastical doctors, he does not mean the bishops and presbyters of the Church (which were originally in all Churches as well as Alexandria) but the doctors of Christian philosophy in the catechetic school, whereof there had been a succession from the first foundation of the Church. And the succession was continued for some ages after: for Clemens Alexandrinus[1] succeeded Pantænus; and Origen,[2] Clemens; Heraclas,[3] Origen; and Dionysius,[4] Heraclas. After whom some[5] add Athenodorus, Malchion, Athanasius, and Didymus. And the author of the Greek Synodicon, published by Pappus, says,[6] Arius taught in the same school before he broached his heresy. It were easy to recount many other such school at Rome, Cæsarea, Antioch, &c. but I shall have another occasion to speak of these, when I come to consider the encouragement that Christian emperors gave to schools of learning and the professors of liberal arts and sciences. What has here been suggested upon this head, may suffice at present to show what was the office of the catechist; and what the use of catechetical schools in the Church.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Ecclesiecdici and Defensores, or Syndics of the Church.

SECT. 1.—Five Sorts of *Defensores* noted, Two whereof only belonged to the Church.

ANOTHER office, which will deserve to be spoken of in this place, because it was sometimes, though not always, managed by the hands of the clergy, is that of the *Defensores;* for the understanding of which, it will be necessary in the first place to distinguish between the civil and ecclesiastical defensors. For Gothofred thinks, there were in all, four sorts of them, viz. The *Defensores Senatûs, Defensores Urbium, Defensores Ecclesiarum,* and *Defensores Paupe-*

[1] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 6 [2] Id. lib. vi. c. 19. [3] Hieron. de Scriptor. in Origene. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 26. [4] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 29. [5] Hospin. de Templis lib. iii. c. 5. [6] Synodicon Con. tom. ii. p. 1494.

rum. But he might have added one more, which Ulpian[1] calls *Defensores rerum publicarum*, whose office was to be a sort of proctors or syndics in managing the public causes of that corporation, or company of tradesmen, to which they belonged; which sort of defensors were first instituted by Alexander Severus, as Lampridius[2] tells us in his life. The *Defensores Civitatum*, or, as they are otherwise called, *Defensores Plebis*, were a sort of Tribunes of the people; one of their chief offices being to defend the poor plebeians against the insults and oppressions of the great and wealthy citizens. Now, in imitation of these, I presume the ecclesiastical defensors were instituted, as both their name and office seem plainly to imply.

SECT. 2.—Of the *Defensores Pauperum*.

The defensors of the poor had much the same employment in the Church, as the *Defensores Plebis* had in the State: for if any of the poor, or virgins, or widows, belonging to the Church, were injured or oppresed by the rich, it was the business of these defensors, as their proctors or advocates, to see them righted, and to solicit the magistrate that they might have justice done them. This is evident, from the decree made in the fifth council of Carthage, Anno 401; which is also inserted into the African Code, and is to this purpose; "That,[3] forasmuch as the Church was incessantly wearied with the complaints and afflictions of the poor, it was unanimously agreed upon by them in council, that the emperors should be petitioned to allow defensors to be chosen for them, by the procurement and approbation of the bishops, that they might defend them from the power and tyranny of the rich.

SECT. 3.—Of the *Defensores Ecclesiæ*, their Office and Function.

As to the other sort of defensors called, *Defensores*

[1] Digest. lib. xlix. tit. 4. leg. 1. [2] Lamprid. Vit. Alexand. Corpora omnium Constituit, Vinariorum, Lupinariorum, Caligariorum, et omnino omnium artium; hisque ex sese Defensores dedit. [3] Con. Carth. v. c. 9. Ab Imperatoribus universis visum est postulandum, propter afflictionem pauperum, quorum molestiis sine intermissione fatigatur Ecclesia, ut defensores eis, adversus potentias divitum, cum episcoporum provisione delegentur. Vid. Cod. Eccles. Afr. Can. 75.

Ecclesiæ, (whom I speak of separately, because Gothofred makes a distinction between them, though others take them to be the same,) their office did as plainly resemble that of the other sort of of civil defensors, called, *Defensores Rerum publicarum:* for, as those were the proctors and syndics of their respective companies, to manage the public concerns of their societies at law upon all emergent occasions; So, these did the same for the Church, whose syndics they were, being employed to solicit the cause of the Church, or any single ecclesiastic, when they were injured or oppressed, and had occasion for redress in a civil court; or if they were not remedied there, they were to address the emperors themselves in the name of the Church, to procure a particular precept in her favour. Thus Possidius[1] tells us in the Life of St. Austin, "that when the circumcellions in their mad zeal had plundered and slain some of the catholic clergy, the defensor of the Church prosecuted them at law for the fact, that the peace of the Church might no more be disturbed or impeded." In the like manner we read in the first council[2] of Carthage, "that it being a thing against the imperial laws for any layman to impose a secular office upon a clergyman; if any such injury was offered to the Church," it is said, "the affront might be redressed, if the defensors of the Church did not fail in their duty:" which plainly implies, that it was the business of the defensors to see the rights of the Church, that were settled upon her by law, truly maintained; and if any encroachments were made upon them, they were to prosecute the aggressors and invaders, before the magistrates, and execute the sentence, which they gave in favour of the Church. It is further observable, from a law of Arcadius and Honorius, recited in the next paragraph, that in case of necessity, they were likewise to make application to the emperors, and bring their mandate to the inferior judges, when they

[1] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 12. De quâ re, ne pacis Ecclesiæ amplius impediretur profectus, Defensor Ecclesiæ inter Leges non siluit, &c. [2] Con. Carth. i. c. 9. Ipsis non liceat Clericos nostros eligere Apothecarios vel Ratiocinatores.—Quod si injuria Constitutionis Imperatoriæ Clericos inquietandos putaverint, si Defensio Ecclesiastica nos non deridet, pudor publicus vindicabitur.

could not otherwise have justice done them. By a canon of the council of Chalcedon, defensors are also empowered to admonish such idle monks, and clerks as resorted to the royal city of Constantinople, without any licence or commission from their bishops; and if after admonition they continued still to loiter there, the same defensors were to expel them thence by force,[1] and cause them to return to their own habitation. It appears also from Justinian's laws,[2] that the defensors, together with the *Œconomi*, were made a sort of superintendents over the *Copiatæ*, or great body of deans, whose business was to attend at funerals, as has been showed before; the defensors were charged with the care of these, both in reference to their revenues and persons. They were likewise to make inquiry, whether every clerk, belonging to the Church, carefully attended the celebration of morning and evening service in the Church; and to inform the bishop of such as neglected, that they might be proceeded against with ecclesiastical censures.[3] These were the chief, if not the only offices of the defensors in the primitive Church. For as to any spiritual power or jurisdiction over the clergy, they had none; nor were they as yet admitted to hear criminal causes, great or little, in the bishop's name. But these things were devolved upon them in later ages, as Morinus[4] shows at large in a long dissertation upon this subject, to which I refer the inquisitive reader, contenting myself to give such an account of the defensor's office and power, as I find it to have been in the ages next after their institution.

SECT. 4.—Of their Quality;—whether they were Clergymen or Laymen.

The next inquiry must be into their quality;—whether they were of the clergy or laity? For learned men are not agreed about this. Petavius[5] says, they were always lay-

---

[1] Con. Chalced. c. 23. Ἀκόντας ἀυτὰς διὰ τῶ ἀυτῶ Ἐκδίκου ἐκβάλλεσθαι, ἐς τὰς ἰδίας καταλαμβάνειν τόπους. [2] Justin. Novel. 59. [3] Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 3. de Epis. leg. 42. n. 10. [4] Morin. de Ordinat. Eccles. par. 3. exercit. xvi. c. 7. [5] Petav. Not. in Epiphan. Hær. 72. n. 10.

men; but Morinus,[1] and Gothofred,[2] with much better reason, assert the contrary; that at first they were generally chosen out of the clergy, till, for some particular reasons, it was thought most proper to have advocates-at-law to discharge this office in the African Churches. This change was made about the year 407, when the African fathers in the council of Carthage[3] petitioned the emperor Honorius "that he would give them leave to choose their defensors out of the *Scholastici*, or *advocates-at-law*, who were actually concerned in pleading of causes; that so they who took upon them the defence of the Churches, might have the same liberty as the provincial priests were used to have, to go upon necessary occasion into the judge's consistory, or council-chamber behind the veil, and there suggest what they thought necessary to promote their own cause, or obviate the plots of their adversaries." In answer to this petition, Honorius shortly after published a law, wherein he granted them liberty to make use of such advocates for their defensors as they desired; for he decreed[4] "that whatever privileges were specially obtained of the emperor, relating to the Church, should be intimated to the judges, and executed, *non per coronatos, not by clergymen*, (as Gothofred rightly explains it,) but by advocates-at-law." So that now it was no longer necessary, that the defensors should be of the clergy; but the office was frequently entrusted in the hands of laymen. Which is further evident from an Epistle of Pope Zosimus, who lived about the same time; for he says,[5] "The defensors of the Church were

---

[1] Morin. Ibid. Exer. xvi. c. 6. n. 16. [2] Gothofred. Not. in Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Epis. leg. 38. [3] Con. African. vulgò dictum. can. 64. Placuit ut petant Legati à gloriosissimis Imperatoribus, ut dent facultatem Defensores constituendi Scholasticos, qui in actu sunt, vel in munere Defensionis causarum; ut more Sacerdotum Provinciæ, iidem ipsi qui Defensionem Ecclesiarum susceperint, habeant facultatem pro negotiis Ecclesiarum, quoties necessitas flagitaverit, vel ad obsistendum obrepentibus, vel ad necessaria suggerenda, ingredi Judicum Secretaria. Vid. Cod. Can. Afr. Gr. Lat. c. 97, et Con. Milevitan. c. 16, to the same purpose. [4] Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Epis. leg. 38. Ut quæcunque de nobis ad Ecclesiam tantùm pertinentia, specialiter fuerint impetrata, non per Coronatos, sed ab Advocatis, eorum arbitratu, et Judicibus innotescant, et sortiantur effectum, &c. [5] Zosim. Ep. i. c. 3. Defensores Ecclesiæ, qui ex Laicis sunt, supradictâ observatione teneantur, si meruerint esse in Ordine Clericatûs.

chosen out of the laity, and might afterward, if they were deserving, be ordained among the clergy." Yet after this, we find the defensors, in some places, continued still to be of the clergy: for Morinus shows, that in the first session of the council of Chalcedon, there is frequent mention made of one John, a presbyter and defensor;[1] as also, in many Epistles of Gregory the Great, the defensors of the Roman Church are said to be of the clergy. To which I shall add a fragment of Theodorus Lector, taken out of Damascen,[2] which speaks of one John, as both deacon and defensor of the Church of St. Stephen, at Constantinople, in the time of Anastatius, the emperor, which was in the beginning of the sixth century. From all which it is very evident against Petavius, that the defensors were sometimes chosen out of the clergy, and not always made of advocates or laymen.

SECT. 5.—The Ἔκδικοι and Ἐκκλησιέκδικοι among the Greeks the same with the Defensors of the Latin Church.

I must not omit to acquaint the reader, that what the Latins call *Defensores*, the Greek Church commonly calls Ἔκδικοι and Ἐκκλησιέκδικοι, which signify the same as defensors; though Gothofred,[3] without any just reason, makes a difference between them. For not only their offices and powers are described to be the same, but also whenever the Greeks have any occasion to speak of the Latin defensors, they give them the name of Ἔκδικοι; as may be seen either in the Code of the African Church,[4] published by Justellus, or that which the Greeks commonly call the council of Carthage, published by Ehinger,[5] and Dr. Beverege,[6] in the Pandects. But whether Προστάτης be another Greek name for a defensor, is not so certain. The word is only found once used by Epiphanius,[7] who speaking of one Cyriacus, styles him Κυριακὸς Προστάτης, which Petavius renders, *Cyriacus defensor*. He seems indeed to have had some office in the Church, because he is joined in the sub-

[1] Con. Chalced. Act. i. [2] Vid. Damascen. Orat. iii. de Imagin. p. 799. et Fragment. Theod. Lector. edit. à Vales. p. 583. Ἰωάννης διάκονος ἐκδικος τῆ ἐναγοῦς δικε Στεφάνε, &c. [3] Gothofred. Not. in Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 2. leg. 38. [4] Cod. Can. Eccles. Afr. c. 75 et 97. [5] Con. Carth. Gr. ap. Ehinger. c. 76 et 99. [6] Con. Carth. ap. Bevereg. c. 78 et 100. [7] Epiph. Hær. 72. Marcel. n. 10.

scription of a letter with the clergy, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, and readers: but whether that be a sufficient reason to make him a defensor, I must leave the judicious reader to determine.

SECT. 6.—Chancellors and Defensors not the same in the Primitive Church.

There is one thing more must be resolved before I dismiss this subject; that is, whether chancellors and defensors were the same in the primitive Church? In answer to which I say, it is very plain they were not; because the first time we find any mention of the office of chancellors in the Church, they are expressly distinguished from the Ἔκδικοι, or *defensors;* and that is in the Novel of Heraclius, made in the beginning of the seventh century, where, determining the number of ecclesiastical officers, that were to be allowed in the great Church of Constantinople, he says, "there should be two syncelli, twelve chancellors,[1] ten defensors, twelve referendaries, forty notaries, and twelve sceuophylaces, whereof four to be presbyters, six deacons, and two readers." It is not very easy to determine what the office of these chancellors was at that time; but it is very evident, however, from this, that they were not the same with the defensors. They, who are acquainted with the civil law, know that the *Cancellarii* in the civil courts were not judges, but officers attending the judge in an inferior station; which appears evidently from a title in both the Theodosian and Justinian Code,[2] *De adsessoribus et domesticis et cancellariis judicum.* Hottoman and Accursius take the mfor actuaries or notaries; but Gothofred,[3] in his learned notes upon the Theodosian Code, proves at large, out of Cassiodore and Agathias, that they were the *Custodes Secretarii, the guards of the judge's consistory,* and called *Cancellarii,* because they stood *ad cancellos, at the rails* or *barriers* which separated the *secretum* from the rest of the court. So that their office then was not to sit as

[1] Heraclius Novel. ii. ap. Leunclav. Just. Gr. Rom. tom. i. p. 79. Καγκελαρίους δὲ εἰς ιβ. ἐκδίκους εἰς ι. [2] Cod. Theod. lib. i. tit. 12. Cod Justin. lib. i. tit. 51. [3] Gothofred Com. in Cod. Theod. lib. i. tit. 12. de Adsessorib. leg. 3.

judges or assessors, but only to attend the judges, and keep peace and good order under him. And if this was the condition of the *Cancellarii* in the state, it is probable they had some such office in the Church in the time of Heraclius, who first mentions them; but what that office was I am not able to determine any further, save only that it was not the same with that of the defensors of the Church.

SECT. 7.—Whether the Defensor's Office was the same with that of our modern Chancellors.

It may be asked then,—whether the office of our modern chancellors has any relation or resemblance to that of defensors in the ancient Church? There are some learned men, who make them altogether the same. Bp. Beverege derives the authority of them both from the same fountain; for he says,[1] "the defensors heard and determined causes in the bishop's name, and those not only, that related to the poor, who sought the patronage of the Church; but also, when presbyters and deacons had any controversy with any other, whether of the clergy or laity, they might bring their action before the Πρωτέκδικος, or *defensor*." Whence he concludes, that chancellors of later ages are the very same ecclesiastical officials as the defensors of the primitive Church. It were to be wished, that that learned person had given us ancient records for that power, which he ascribes to the old defensors; for then they would have looked more like chancellors under another name. But indeed the authorities he alleges are all modern, such as Papias's Glossary, and Balsamon's Meditata, and the Catalogues of Officials in the Church of Constantinople, which were written several ages after the first institution of defensors, and in times when the *Protecdicus* among the Greeks was become an officer of great authority and power. So that though the power of chancellors might be much the same as that of the Ἔκδικοι among the modern Greeks; yet that it was altogether the same with the ancient defensors, seems not hitherto to be solidly proved; since the business of the ancient defensors

[1] Bevereg. Not. in Can. 23. Con. Chalced.

was not to do the office of judges, but of advocates-at-law, to defend the rights of the poor, and the liberties of the Church, against all aggressors and invaders. But if any can show, from ancient records, that the defensors had a larger power, he will very much oblige the world with such a discovery. In the mean time, the reader will pardon me for not ascribing to them greater powers than I had authority to do. The matter is curious, and may exercise the pens of learned men, and be the subject of further disquisition and inquiry.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Œconomi.

SECT. I.—The *Œconomi* instituted in the Fourth Century. The Reasons of their Institution.

IN the writings of the fourth and fifth centuries we frequently meet with an officer in the Church, styled by the Greeks[1] Οἰκονόμος, and by the Latins,[2] *Œconomus*, or *Præpositus Domus*, as it is in St. Austin.[3] His office was to manage the revenues of the whole diocese, under the inspection of the bishop. For anciently, as I have showed elsewhere,[4] the whole revenue of the Church was intrusted in the hands of the bishop, to be divided among the clergy and poor of the Church by his direction and appointment; and in managing this affair he commonly made use of his archdeacon, as a proper assistant to ease himself of the great burthen and incumbrance of it. But upon the general conversion of heathens, and the consequent augmentation of every diocese, and Church-revenues, both the bishop and his archdeacon had business enough of another nature to take up the greatest part of their time: and then it was found necessary to institute officers on purpose, and set them over this affair, under the name of *Œconomi*, or *stew-*

[1] Vid. Con. Chalced. c. 2, 25, 26. [2] Liberat. Breviar. c. 16.
[3] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 24. [4] Book ii. chap. iv. sect. 6.

of the Church. Morinus[1] thinks they were instituted void suspicion; and in some Churches there is no tion but it was so; for in the remaining fragments of ouncil of Tyre, Anno 448, which are inserted into the of the council of Chalcedon,[2] we find that Ibas, bishop lessa, being accused by some of his clergy for em- ing the revenues of the Church, is obliged to pro- , that for the future the revenues should be managed *Œconomi*, or *stewards*, chosen out of the clergy, after nanner of the great Church of Antioch. And it is not obable, but the like accusation being brought against corus, bishop of Alexandria, in the council of Chalce- was the reason, that moved that council to make a ral decree in this matter, "that forasmuch as they informed, that in some Churches the bishops alone nistered the ecclesiastical revenues without any stew- they now ordained, that every Church, having a bishop, ld also have[3] a steward of her own clergy, to manage evenues of the Church by the direction of the bishop: so there might be witnesses of the right administration em; and by that means neither the Church's goods be ezzled, nor any scandal or reproach brought upon the thood." But then I cannot think this was the case of hurches: for these canons were made plainly against bishops as managed the revenues of the Church, *ἄφτυροι*," as the canon words it, without either arch- on or *Œconomus* to attest the fidelity of their manage- . But in such Churches, where bishops took the assis- of their archdeacon, this could not be the reason for ıg up the office of the *Œconomus;* because suspicion ismanagement was provided against, as well by the nony of an archdeacon, as any other officer that could ppointed. And therefore I have assigned a more ral, and as I take it, a truer reason for the institution is office in the Church.

---

[1] rin. de Ordinat. Eccl. par. iii. exerc. 16. c. 5. n. 3. [2] Con. d. Act. 9. [3] Con. Chalced. c. 26. Ἔδοξεν πᾶσαν Ἐκκλησίαν ον ἔχουσαν, καὶ οἰκονόμον ἔχειν ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου κλήρου. - - - ὥστε μὴ ἀμάρτυρον ν οἰκονομίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, &c.

SECT. 2.—Always to be chosen out of the Clergy.

And that, which further confirms my opinion, is, that the *Œconomi*, as well as the archdeacons, were always to be chosen out of the clergy. For so those canons of the councils of Tyre and Chalcedon, already cited, plainly direct; and for any thing, that appears to the contrary, this was the constant practice of the Church. We find in the Acts of the council of Ephesus,[1] which are inserted also into the council of Chalcedon, one Charisius styled both presbyter and *Œconomus* of the Church of Philadelphia. And Liberatus[2] speaks of one John, who was *Œconomus* of Alexandria, and presbyter of Tabennesus, a region belonging to Alexandria. Possidius tells us in the Life of St. Austin,[3] "that he always made one of his clergy the *Præpositus Domus*, (as he calls him) whose office was to take care of the Church-revenues, and give an account of what he received and expended, when it was demanded of him." And to the same purpose Socrates[4] says of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, "that having advanced two monks to the honour of the clergy, he made them the *Œconomi* of the Church." So that it was both the rule and practice of the Church to take the *Œconomi* out of some of the clergy, and we never meet with any instance or order to the contrary; which argues plainly, that the true reason for devolving this office upon them, which formerly belonged to the archdeacons, was no other than that because of a multiplicity of business the archdeacons now could not so well attend it.

SECT. 3.—Their Office to take care of the Revenues of the Church, especially in the Vacancy of the Bishopric.

What the office itself was, appears from what has already

---

[1] Con. Ephes. in Act. 1. Con. Chalced. tom. iv. p. 292. Charisius Presbyter et Œconomus Philadelphiæ. [2] Liberat. Breviar. c. 16. Johannes ex Œconomo factus Presbyter Tabennesiotes. - - - Factusque est iterum Œconomus, habens causas omnium Ecclesiarum. [3] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 24. Domûs Ecclesiæ curam, omnemque substantiam ad vices valentioribus Clericis delegabat et credebat; nunquam clavem, nunquam annulum in manu habens, sed ab eisdem Domûs Præpositis cuncta et accepta et erogata notabantur. [4] Socrat. lib. vi. c. 7. Τὴν οἰκονομίαν Ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῖς ἐνεχείρισεν.

d: to which I shall only add one thing; that, by
›rity of, the council of Chalcedon,[1] the *Œconomus*
:ontinue in his office during the vacancy of the
:, and to look after the income of the Church, that
be preserved safe for the succeeding bishop; which
›me not improbably think, was designed to prevent
filling of vacant sees; that no metropolitan, or
or, under whose care the vacant Church was,
: under any temptation to defer the election of a
op, in hopes of enriching himself from the reve-
he Church. But whether this was the reason or
rtainly argues, that these men were generally per-
extraordinary credit and worth, since the Church
:urely repose so great a confidence in them.

4.—The Consent of the Clergy required in the Choice of them.

ıdeed all imaginable care was taken in their elec-
t they should be persons of such a character: to
urpose some canons required, that they should
n by all the clergy; as particularly Theophilus,
f Alexandria,[2] in his Canonical Epistle, gives a
in that case. Which provision was but reason-
since all the clergy had a common concern in the
of the Church, which were their livelihood and
ıce, it was fit the *Œconomus*, to whose care the
were committed, should be chosen by common
that he might be a person without exception, and
ıave reason to complain, that he was injured or
d of his dividend or portion.

CHAP. XIII.

lccount of some other Inferior Officers in the Church.

SECT. 1.—Of the Παραμονάριοι, or *Mansionarii*.

: the officers already mentioned, there were in the

ıalced. c. 25. [2] Theophil. Can. ix. ap. Bevereg. Pandect.
73. Γνώμῃ παντὸς ἱερατεῖα οἰκονόμον ἀποδειχθῆναι, &c.

fourth and fifth centuries some few others, whose names are not very commonly met with; and therefore I shall but just hint the signification of them, and not spend my time in any curious inquiries about their offices and employments. The same canon[1] of the council of Chalcedon, which speaks of the *Œconomus* and *Defensor*, mentions also another officer belonging to the Church, who is styled Παραμονάριος in the language of that council. But the translators and critics are not agreed upon the meaning of the word. The ancient translation of Dionysius Exiguus renders it *Mansionarius*, and explains that, in a marginal reading, by *Ostiarius*, or *door-keeper* of the Church. And indeed this was the office of the *Mansionarius* in the Roman Church, about the time when Dionysius Exiguus lived. For Gregory, the Great, not long after in one of his Dialogues,[2] speaking of Abundius Mansionarius, gives him also the title of *Custos Ecclesiæ;* and in another Dialogue he makes it the office of the *Mansionarius*[3] to light the lamps or candles of the Church. Yet notwithstanding this the best learned of the modern critics give another sense of the Greek name Παραμονάριος. Justellus[4] explains it by *Villicus, a bailiff*, or *steward of the lands*. Bishop Beverege[5] styles him *Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Administrator*, which is the same. And their opinion is confirmed by Gothofred, Cujacius, Suicerus, Vossius, and many others, whose judgment in the case may be sufficient to decide the controversy, till the reader sees better reason otherwise to determine him.

SECT. 2.—Of the *Custodes Ecclesiarum*, and *Custodes Locorum Sanctorum;* and how those differed from each other.

The civil law takes notice of another sort of officers, who are called *Custodes Ecclesiarum*, and *Custodes Locorum Sanctorum;* which though some writers confound together, yet Gothofred makes a distinction between them. The *Custodes Ecclesiarum* were either the same with the *Ostiarii*, or order of *door-keepers;* or else with those called

[1] Con. Chalced. c. 2. [2] Greg. M. Dial. lib. iii. c. 25. [3] Ib. Dial. lib. i. c. 5. Constantius Mansionarius omnes lampades Ecclesiæ implevit aquâ, etc. [4] Justel. Bibliothec. Jur. can. tom. i. p. 91. [5] Bevereg. Not. in Con. Chalced. c. 2.

miores Ecclesiæ, which, as I have showed[1] in another ace, were much of the same nature with our church-ardens and vestry-men. But the *Custodes Locorum Sanc-rum* were the keepers of those particular places in Palæs-ne, which, if Gothofred judges right, had more peculiarly e title of *Loca Sancta, holy places*, because they were a rt of memorials of our Saviour; such as Bethlehem, the ace of his nativity; and Mount Golgotha, the place of s crucifixion; and his grave or monument, which was the ace of his resurrection; and Mount Olivet, the place of s ascension. These places were frequently visited by hristians in those ages, as appears from Eusebius, Gregory yssen, St. Jerom, and several others, whom the reader, at is curious in this matter, may find quoted by Gothofred,[2] ho maintains, "that upon that very account those places d a sort of guardians or keepers assigned them, under e title of *Custodes Locorum Sanctorum*." But however is matter be, it is certain they had such an employment in e Church, as in the eye of the law was reputed a religious rvice; and accordingly they were entitled to the same ivilege[3] as the ecclesiastics had, to be exempt from per-nal tribute, in regard to this their employment; as appears om a law of Theodosius the Great, by whom this immunity as granted them.

SECT. 3.—Of the *Sceuophylaces*, or *Ceimeliarchæ*.

Next to these, for the similitude of the name and office, mention the *Sceuophylaces*, or, as they were otherwise lled, Κειμηλίων φύλακες, *keepers of the* Κειμήλια, that is, e sacred vessels, utensils, and such precious things, as ere laid up in the sacred repository of the Church. This as commonly some presbyter; for Theodorus Lector[4] ys, Macedonius was both presbyter and *Sceuophylax* of

---

Book ii. chap. xix. sect. 19. [2] Gothofred. Not. in Cod. Th. lib. xvi. . 2. leg. 26. [3] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Epis. leg. 26. Universos, s constiterit Custodes Ecclesiarum esse, vel Sanctorum Locorum, ac reli-sis obsequiis deservire, nullius adtentationis molestiam sustinere decerni-s. Quis enim eos capite censos patiatur esse devinctos, quos necessariò elligit supra memorato obsequio mancipatos? [4] Theodor. Lector. . ii.

the Church of Constantinople; and Sozomen,[1] before him, speaking of the famous Theodore, presbyter of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom in the days of Julian, styles him "Φύλακα τῶν κειμηλίων, *keeper of the sacred utensils;*" and says, "he was put to death because he would not deliver up, what he had under his custody, to the persecutors." It will not be improper to give this officer also the name of *Chartophylax* and *Custos Archivorum*, because the rolls and archives are reckoned part of the sacred repository of the Church. Whence Suicerus[2] observes, that in Photius the names *Sceuophylax* and *Chartophylax* are given to the same person. But I must note, that the modern Greeks have a little changed this office, and added powers to it, which did not belong to it in the primitive Church. For now, as Balsamon[3] informs us, the *Chartophylax* acts as the patriarch's substitute, excommunicating, censuring, and licensing the ordinations of presbyters and deacons, and sits as supreme ecclesiastical judge, under the patriarch, in many other cases relating to the Church; which are things we do not find belonging to the office of a *Sceuophylax* in the primitive ages.

Sect. 4.—Of the *Hermeneutæ*, or *Interpreters*.

Epiphanius takes notice of another sort of officers in the Church, to whom he gives the name[4] of Ἑρμηνευταὶ, *interpreters*, and says, "their office was to render one language into another, as there was occasion, both in reading the Scriptures, and in the homilies that were made to the people." That there was such an office in the Church appears further from the Passion of Procopius, the martyr, published by Valesius,[5] where it is said, "that Procopius had three offices in the Church of Scythopolis: he was reader, exorcist, and interpreter of the Syriac tongue." I

---

[1] Sozom. lib. v. c. 8.

[2] Suicer. Thesaur. tom. ii. p. 971.

[3] Balsam. Not. ad Can. 9. Con. Nic. 2.

[4] Epiph. Expos. Fid. n. 21. Ἑρμηνευταὶ γλώσσης εἰς γλῶσσαν, ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσιν, ἢ ἐν ταῖς προσομιλίαις.

[5] Acta Procop. ap. Vales. Not. in Euseb. de Martyr. Palæstin. c. 1. Ibi Ecclesiæ tria Ministeria præbebat, unum in legendi officio, alterum in Syri interpretatione sermonis, et tertium adversus Dæmones manûs impositione consummans.

eive the office was chiefly in such Churches, where the le spake different languages; as in the Churches of stine, where probably some spake Syriac, and others k; and in the Churches of Afric, where some spake ı, and others Punic. In such Churches there was oc- n for an interpreter, that those, who understood not the uage in which the Scriptures were read, or the homilies ched, might receive edification by having them imme- ly rendered into a tongue which they did under- l. So far was the primitive Church from encouraging rance, by locking up the Scriptures in an unknown ue, that she not only translated them into all lan- ges, but also appointed a standing office of interpreters, were *vivâ voce* to make men understand what was read, not suffer them to be barbarians in the service of God; h is a tyranny that was unknown to former ages.

Sect. 5.—Of the *Notarii*.

nother office, that must not wholly be passed over, st we are upon this head, is that of the *Notarii*, or *ptores*, as the Latins called them; who are the same the Greeks call Ὀξυγράφοι, and Ταχυγράφοι, from their ing *short-hand* by characters, which was necessary in service they were chiefly employed in. For the first of them was to take in writing the whole process of the hen judges against the Christian martyrs, and minutely scribe the several circumstances of their examination passion; what questions were put to them; what ers they made; and whatever passed during the time eir trial and suffering. Whence such descriptions called, *Gesta Martyrum, the acts and monuments of nartyrs;* which were the original accounts, which every rch preserved of her own martyrs. The first institution ese *Notarii* into a standing office at Rome, Bishop son[1] and some other learned persons think, was under an in the time of the Decian persecution. For in one

---

arson. de Succession. Epis. Rom. Dissert. i. c. 4. n. 3. Fell. Not. in Ep. 12.

of the most ancient Catalogues[1] of the bishops of Rome, Fabian is said to have appointed seven subdeacons to inspect the seven notaries, and see that they faithfully collected the acts of the martyrs. But though it was no standing office before, yet the thing itself was always done by some persons fitly qualified for the work; as appears from the ancient Acts of Ignatius and Polycarp, and several others, which were written before Fabian is said to have instituted public and standing notaries at Rome. In after ages, these notaries were also employed in writing the Acts of the councils, and taking speeches and disputations, and whatever else passed in the synod. Thus Eusebius[2] notes, "that Malchion's dispute with Paulus Samosatensis in the council of Antioch was recorded, as it was spoken, by the notaries, who took it from their mouths:" and Socrates says the same[3] of the disputation between Basilius Ancyranus, and Photinus, in the council of Sirmium. We read, also, of a sort of notaries in councils, whose office was to recite all instruments, allegations, petitions, or whatever else of the like nature was to be offered or read in council. And these were commonly deacons, aud sometimes a presbyter was the chief of them, and thereupon styled *Primicerius Notariorum;* as in the Acts of the general councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon[4] there is frequent mention of Aetius, deacon and notary, and Peter, presbyter of Alexandria, and chief of the notaries, *Primicerius Notariorum.* There were also notaries, that were employed to take the discourses of famous and eloquent preachers from their mouths; by which means, Socrates[5] observes, many of St. Chrysostom's sermons were preserved, and some of Atticus, his successor. Bishops also had their private Ὑπογραφεῖς, which some call notaries; but Valesius[6] reckons them in the quality of readers. Whatever they were, Athanasius served in this

---

[1] Catalog. Rom. Pontif. in Fabian. Hic fecit sex vel septem Subdiaconos, qui septem Notariis imminerent, ut Gesta Martyrum fideliter colligerent.
[2] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 29. Ἐπισημειωμένων ταχυγράφων. [3] Socrat. lib. ii. c. 30. Ὀξυγράφων τὰς φωνὰς αὐτῶν γραφόντων. [4] Con. Ephes. Act. i. in Actione 1. Con. Chalced. tom. iv. p. 292. [5] Socrat. lib. vi. c. 4. It. lib. vii. c. 2. [6] Vales. Not. in Socr. lib. v. c. 22.

office, as Ὑπογραφεὺς, under Alexander, and Proclus under Atticus, as Socrates[1] informs us.

SECT. 6.—Of the *Apocrisarii* or *Responsales*.

The curious reader, perhaps, will find several other of these lesser offices, which he will think might come into his catalogue; but that I may not seem too minute in small matters, I will only add one office more, which is that of the *Apocrisarii* or *Responsales*. These were a sort of residents, in the imperial city, in the name of foreign Churches and bishops, whose office was to negociate, as proctors, at the emperor's court, in all ecclesiastical causes, wherein their principals might be concerned. The institution of the office seems to have been in the time of Constantine, or not long after, when, the emperors being become Christians, foreign Churches had more occasion to promote their suits at the imperial court than formerly. However, we find it established by law in the time of Justinian; for in one of his Novels[2] it is ordered, "that forasmuch as no bishop was to be long absent from his Church without special command from the emperor; if, therefore, any one had occasion to negociate any ecclesiastical cause at court, he should prefer his petition, either by the *Apocrisarius* of his Church, whose business was to act in behalf of the Church, and prosecute her affairs; or else by the *Œconomus*, or some other of his clergy, sent on purpose to signify his request." It does not, indeed, appear from that law, that these *Apocrisarii* were of the clergy, but from other writers we may easily collect it. For Liberatus[3] says, "Anatolius, a deacon of Alexandria, was *Apocrisarius*, or resident for Dioscorus, his bishop, at Constantinople, by which means he gained a favourable opportunity of being chosen bishop of Constantinople upon the death of Flavian." And Evagrius[4]

---

[1] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 17 et 41. [2] Justin. Novel. vi. c. 2. Sancimus, si quando propter Ecclesiasticam occasionem inciderit necessitas, hanc aut per nos qui res agunt sanctarum Ecclesiarum (quos Apocrisarios vocant) aut per aliquos Clericos huc destinatos, aut Œconomos suos notam imperio facere, &c. [3] Liberat. Breviar. c. 12. Ordinatus est pro eo (Flaviano) Anatolius Diaconus, qui fuit Constantinopoli Apocrisarius Dioscori. [4] Evagr. lib. iv. c. 38. Ταῖς ἀποκρίσεσιν Ἀμασείας Ἐπισκόπου διηκονεῖτο, &c.

observes the same of Eutychius, "that, from being *Apocrisarius* to the bishop of Amasia, he was immediately advanced to be bishop of the royal city after Mennas:" which seems plainly to imply, that he was one of the clergy before, since it does not appear, that he was promoted *per saltum*. I must further observe, that, in imitation of these *Apocrisarii* in the Church, almost every monastery had their *Apocrisarii* likewise, whose business was not to reside in the royal city, as the former did, but to act as proctors for their monastery or any member of it; when they had occasion to give any appearance at law before the bishop, under whose jurisdiction they were. This is clear from another of Justinian's Novels,[1] which requires the ascetics in such cases to answer by their *Apocrisarii* or *Responsales*. And these were sometimes also of the clergy, as appears from the Acts of the fifth general-council, where one Theonas[2] styles himself presbyter and *Apocrisarius* of the monastery of Mount Sinai. The Latin translator calls him *Ambasiator*, which is not so very proper, yet it in some measure expresses the thing; for as Suicerus[3] observes, in process of time the emperors also gave the name of *Apocrisarii* to their own embassadors, and it became the common title of every legate whatsoever; which I the rather note, that the reader may distinguish these things, and not confound the civil and ecclesiastical sense of the name *Apocrisarius* together. And thus much of the inferior orders and offices of the clergy in the primitive Church.

---

[1] Justin. Novel. 79. c. 1. [2] Con. 5. Gen. Act. 1. in Libell. Monachor. Syriæ Secundæ, tom. v. p. 116. Θεωνᾶς πρεσβύτερος, καὶ ἀπυκρισιάριος τοῦ ἁγίου ὄρους Σινᾶ, [3] Suicer. Thesaur. tom. i. p. 456.

BOOK IV.

OF THE ELECTIONS AND ORDINATIONS OF THE CLERGY, AND THE PARTICULAR QUALIFICATIONS OF SUCH AS WERE TO BE ORDAINED.

CHAP. I.

Of the several ways of Designing Persons to the Ministry, in the Apostolical and Primitive Ages of the Church.

Sect. 1.—Four several Ways of Designing Persons for the Ministry. Of the First Way, by casting Lots.

Having thus far given an account of all the orders of the clergy in the primitive Church, both superior and inferior, together with the several offices and functions, that were annexed to them,—I now proceed to consider the rules and methods, that were observed in setting apart fit persons for the ministry, especially for the three superior orders, which were always of principal concern. And here, in the first place, it will be proper to observe, that in the apostolical and following ages there were four several ways of designing persons for the ministry, or discovering who were most fit to be ordained; the first of which was by casting lots; the second by making choice of the first fruits of the Gentile converts; the third by particular direction and inspiration of the Holy Ghost; and the last in the common and ordinary way of examination and election. The first method was observed in the designation of Matthias to be an Apostle, as we read Acts i. 23, 26. where it is said, "that the disciples themselves first appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, and Matthias; and then praying to God, that he would show whether of those two he had chosen, they gave forth their

lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias." St. Chrysostom[1] says, "they used this method, because as yet the Holy Ghost was not descended on them, and they had not at this time the power of choosing by inspiration; and therefore they committed the business to prayer, and left the determination to God." The author of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, under the name of Dionysius,[2] fancies, that God answered their prayer by some visible token: but if so, this had not been choosing by lot, as the Scripture says it was, but a quite different method of election. However interpreters generally agree, that there was something extraordinary in it: Dr. Lightfoot[3] thinks Matthias had no other ordination to his Apostleship; for the Apostles did not give him any ordination by imposition of hands after this, as they did to presbyters afterwards; and that, if true, was extraordinary indeed. Others reckon the extraordinariness of it to consist in the singular way of electing and designing him to that office by lot; for they say[4] all ecclesiastical history scarce affords such another instance: and I confess there are not very many, but some few there are, which show, that that method of electing was not altogether so singular as is commonly imagined. For in Spain it was once the common practice, as may be concluded from a canon[5] of the council of Barcelona, Anno 599, which orders, "that, when a vacant bishopric is to be filled, two or three shall be elected by the consent of the clergy and people, who shall present them to the metropolitan and his fellow-bishops, and they, having first fasted, shall cast lots, leaving the determination to Christ the Lord; then he, on whom the lot shall fall, shall be consummated by the blessing of consecration." There is nothing different in this from the first example, save only that in this there is express mention of a consecration afterward, which is not in the history of Matthias; and yet perhaps there might be a consecration

[1] Chrys. Hom. v. in 1 Tim.
[2] Dionys. Eccl. Hier. c. v. p. 367.
[3] Lightfoot. in Act. 1. 26.
[4] Dodwel. Dissert. 1. in Cypr. n. 17.
[5] Con. Barcinon. c. 3. tom. v. p. 1606. Duobus aut tribus, quos ante consensus Cleri et Plebis elegerit, Metropolitani judicio ejusque Coepiscopis præsentatis, quem sors, præeunte jejunio, Christo Domino terminante, monstraverit, Benedictio consecrationis accumulet.

in his case too, though not expressly mentioned; but I leave this to further inquiry.

SECT. 2.—The Second Way by making Choice of the First-fruits of the Gentile Converts.

The second way of designation was by making choice of the first-fruits of the Gentile converts to be ordained to the ministry. For these expressing a greater zeal than others, by their readiness and forwardness to embrace the Gospel, were generally pitched upon by the Apostles, as best qualified for propagating the Christian religion in the world. Clemens Romanus, in his epistle[1] to the Corinthians says, "the Apostles in all countries and cities, where they preached, ordained their first converts bishops and deacons, for the conversion of others; and that they had the direction of the Spirit for doing this." And hence the author, that personates the same Clemens, in his pretended Epistle to James, bishop of Jerusalem, giving him an account of the reasons that moved St. Peter to ordain him, says,[2] "it was because he was chief of the first-fruits of his converts among the Gentiles." Some compare this to the right of primogeniture among the ancient patriarchs, which intitled the first-born to the priesthood; and I will not deny but there might be something of allusion in it; but then the parallel will not hold throughout; for in the latter case it was not any natural right, but personal merit attending their primogeniture, that intitled the first converts to the Christian priesthood.

SECT. 3.—The Third Way by particular Direction of the Holy Ghost.

Which will appear further by considering, that many of them were ordained by the particular direction of the Holy Ghost. For so the words, Δοκιμάζοντες τῷ Πνεύματι, in Clemens Romanus may be understood, to signify the Spirit's pointing out the particular persons, whom he would have

---

[1] Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. n. 42. Κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες, καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάζοντες τῷ Πνεύματι εἰς ἐπίσκοπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. [2] Pseudo-Clem. Ep. ad Jacob. ap. Coteler. tom. i. p. 606. Σὺ γὰρ δι' ἐμὲ τῶν σωζομένων ἐθνῶν εἶ κρείττων ἀπαρχή.

to be ordained; which I observed to be the third way of designation of persons to the ministry, very usual in those primitive times of the Church. Thus Timothy was chosen and ordained, "according to the prophecies that went before of him." 1 Tim. i. 18; whence his ordination is also called, "the gift that was given him by prophecy," 1 Tim. iv. 14. In regard to which, the ancient interpreters, Chrysostom[1] and Theodoret say, "he had not any human vocation, but was chosen by divine revelation, and ordained by the direction of the Spirit." Clemens Alexandrinus in his famous Homily, entitled, *Quis Dives salvetur*, observes the same of the clergy of the Asiatic Churches, whom St. John ordained after his return from the isle of Patmos; he says, "they were such as were signified or pointed out[2] to him by the Spirit." I know indeed Combefis[3] puts a different sense upon these words, and says, "the designation here spoken of, means not any new or distinct revelation, but I know not what divine predestination of the persons; or else their ordination itself, which was the seal or consignation of the Spirit; and that there is no authority for the common sense, which interpreters put upon this passage." But as he owns his notion to be singular, and contrary to the sense of all other learned men; so it is evidently against matter of fact and ancient history, which affords several other instances of the like designations in the following ages. I will give an instance or two out of many. Eusebius[4] says "Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, was chosen *κατὰ ἀποκαλυψιν*, *by revelation*, and an oracular voice, which signified to some ascetics of the Church, that they should go forth out of the gates of the city, and there meet him, whom God had appointed to be their bishop;" which was this Alexander, a stranger from Cappadocia, coming npon other business to Jerusalem. He was indeed bishop of another place before, but his translation to the see of Jerusalem was wholly by

[1] Chrys. et Theod. in 1 Tim. 1. 18. [2] Clem. Alex. ap. Euseb. lib. iii. c. 23. et ap. Combefis. auctar. Noviss. p. 185. Κλήρῳ ἔναγε τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τὸ Πνεύματος σημαινομένων. [3] Combefis. Not. in Loc. p. 192. Quos Spiritus designâsset divinâ potius prædestinatione, quàm novâ aliquâ et distinctâ revelatione, quam nec Clemens significavit, nec ulla probat auctoritas, &c. [4] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 11.

e direction, which is the thing I allege it for. We another such instance in the election of Alexander, ned *Carbonarius*, bishop of Comana, mentioned by ory Nyssen in the Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus. Alexander was a Gentile philosopher, and very learned who upon his conversion to Christianity, that he t avoid observation, and follow his philosophical es with the greater privacy, in his great humility be- himself to the trade of a collier, whence he had the of *Carbonarius*. Now it happened, upon the va- of the bishopric of Comana, that the citizens sent to ory Thaumaturgus to desire him to come and ordain a bishop; but they not agreeing in their choice, one, ay of jest and ridicule, proposed Alexander, the col- who being discovered[1] by special revelation to Gre- Thaumaturgus to be a man of extraordinary virtues worth, who had submitted to that contemptible calling to avoid being taken notice of, and being found, upon e inquiry, to be the man he was represented to be, hereupon unanimously chosen by all the Church to be bishop, and immediately ordained by St. Gregory. Cy- often speaks of this divine designation, in the case of rinus[2] and Aurelius,[3] when they were but to be ned readers. And he says also, "he had a divine tion[4] to translate Numidicus from another Church he Church of Carthage." And Sozomen[5] tells us, Apollinarius, "that Alexander, bishop of Alexan- appointed Athanasius his successor by divine com- l. For some time before his death it was signified to by divine revelation, that no one should succeed him Athanasius; and therefore when he lay upon his

---

ssen. tom. iii. p. 562. [2] Cypr. Ep. 34. al. 39. ad Cler. Carth. imus ad vos Celerinum Fratrem nostrum---Clero nostro non humanâ gatione, sed divinâ dignatione conjunctum. Qui cùm consentire dubi- Ecclesiæ ipsius admonitu et hortatu iu visione per noctem compulsus negaret nobis suadentibus, &c. [3] Id. Ep. 33. al. 38. Expect- ion sunt testimonia humana, cum præcedunt divina suffragia. [4] Id. 5. al. 40. Admonitos nos et instructos sciatis dignatione divinâ, ut icus Presbyter adscribatur Presbyterorum Carthaginiensium numero. m. lib. ii. c. 17. Αλέξανδρος διάδοχον αυτέ κατέλιπεν Αθανάσιον. Θείαις ξεσιν ἐπ'ἀυτὸν ἀγαγῶν τὴν ψῆφον, &c.

death-bed, he called Athanasius by name, who was then absent, and fled for fear of being made bishop; and another of the same name, who was present, answering to the call, he said nothing to him, but called Athanasius again; which he did several times, whereby it was at last understood, that he meant the Athanasius, that was fled; to whom, though absent, he then prophetically said, Thinkest thou that thou art escaped, Athanasius? No; thou art not escaped." It were easy to add many other instances of the like nature, but these are sufficient to show against Combefis, that in those early ages men were sometimes designed to the ministry by particular divine revelation and prophecy, or else the ancients themselves were wonderfully deceived. Whilst I am upon this head, I must suggest two things further:—First, that a dove's lighting upon the head of any man at an election was usually taken for a divine omen; and commonly the person, who had that sign, was looked upon as pointed out by the Spirit, and accordingly chosen before all others, as having a sort of emblem of the Holy Ghost. Eusebius observes,[1] it was this that turned the election upon Fabian, bishop of Rome, and gave him the preference before all others, though he was a stranger. "No one, at first, thought of choosing him; but a dove being observed by the people to settle upon his head, they took it for an emblem of the Holy Ghost, which heretofore descended upon our Saviour in the form of a dove; and thereupon, with one consent, as if they had been moved themselves by the Holy Ghost, they cried out Ἄξιον, *he was worthy;* which was the word then used to signify their consent; and so, without more ado, they took him and set him upon the bishop's throne." The election of Severus, bishop of Ravenna, and that of Euortius, bishop of Orleans, were determined the same way; as Blondel[2] has observed out of their lives, in Surius; and the inquisitive reader may furnish himself with other instances from his own observation. The other thing I would suggest is, that sometimes an accidental circumstance was so providentially disposed, as to be taken for an indication of

[1] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 29.

[2] Blondel. Apol. p. 426. Surius Vit. Sanctor. Feb. 1. et Sep. 7.

the divine will, and approbation of an election. Sulpicius Severus makes this observation particularly upon a circumstance, that happened in the election of St. Martin, bishop of Tours. Some of the provincial bishops, who were met at the place, for very unjust reasons opposed his election; and more especially one, whose name was Defensor, was a violent stickler against him. Now it happened, that the reader, who was to have read that day, not being able to get in due time to his place, by reason of the press and crowding of the people, and the rest being in a little confusion upon that account, one of those that stood by, taking up a book, read the first verse that he lighted upon, which happened to be those words of the 8th psalm, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise, because of thine enemies, that thou mightest destroy the enemy and defensor." For so it seems the vulgar Gallican translation then read it,—*Ut destruas inimicum et defensorem.* These words were no sooner read, but the people gave a shout, and the adverse party were confounded. "And so," says our author,[1] "it was generally believed, that this psalm was read by divine appointment, that Defensor, the bishop, might hear his own work condemned, whilst the praises of God were perfected in St. Martin, *out of the mouths of babe and sucklings,* and the enemy was at once both discovered and destroyed." By what has been said, the reader now will be able to judge of the meaning of the ancients, when they speak of particular divine designations of persons to the ministry of the Church.

SECT. 4.—The Fourth Way by Common Suffrage and Election.

The fourth and last way of designation was by the ordinary course of suffrage and election of the Church: the method of which in general was so accurate and highly approved, that one of the Roman emperors, though an heathen, thought fit to give a great character and encomium of it, and propose it to himself as an example proper

[1] Sever. Vit. S. Martin. c. 7. p. 225. Ita habitum est, divino nutu Psalmum hunc lectum fuisse, ut testimonium operis sui Defensor audiret, quia ex ore infantium atque lactentium in Martino Domini laude perfectâ, et ostensus pariter et destructus est inimicus.

to be imitated in the designation and choice of civil officers for the service of the empire. For so Lampridius[1] represents the practice of Alexander Severus; "whenever he was about to constitute any governors of provinces, or receivers of the public revenues, he first proposed their names, desiring the people to make evidence against them, if any one could prove them guilty of any crime; but if they accused them falsely, it should be at the peril of their own lives; saying, it was unreasonable, that, when the Christians and Jews did this in propounding those, whom they ordained their priests and ministers, the same should not be done in the appointment of governors of provinces, in whose hands the lives and fortunes of men were entrusted." This argues, that all imaginable care was taken in the election of Christian ministers, since their practice in this respect has such ample testimony from the heathens. And indeed all modern writers agree upon the matter in general, that anciently elections were made with a great deal of caution and exactness: but as to the particular methods, that were used, men are strangely divided in their accounts of them; by which means there is no one subject has been rendered more intricate and perplexed than this of elections, which has even frighted some from attempting to give an account of it. But I must not wholly disappoint my readers through such fears, and therefore I shall briefly acquaint them with the different sentiments of modern authors, who have handled this subject, and then clear what I take to be the true state of the case, from evident proofs of ancient history, which shall be the business of the next chapter.

CHAP. II.

A more particular Account of the ancient Method and Manner of Elections of the Clergy.

SECT. 1.—The different Opinions of Learned Men concerning the People's Power anciently in Elections.

THE grand question in this affair, upon which learned men are so much divided, is concerning the persons, who

[1] Lamprid. Vit. Alex. Sever. c. 45.

had a right to vote in the elections of the clergy. Some think the people were never allowed any other power, save only to give their testimonials to the party elected, or to make objections, if they had any just and reasonable exceptions, against him; so Habertus,[1] and Sixtus Senensis,[2] and Bellarmin.[3] Others say the people were absolute and proper electors, and that from apostolical right, which they always enjoyed for a succession of many ages. This opinion is advanced, and with great show of learning asserted by Blondel[4] against Sancta Clara, and the rest of the other opinion. De Marca[5] takes a middle way between those two extremes; he says, "the people had as much power anciently as any of the clergy below bishops;" that is, their consent was required in the promotion of a bishop, as well as their testimony; yet he will not allow this to be called electing: for the designation, election, or judgment, he says, still belonged only to the metropolitan together with the synod of provincial bishops. And though we read sometimes of their giving their vote or suffrage; "yet that," he says, "is only to be understood of suffrage of consent, not the suffrage of election." But Mr. Mason,[6] in answer to Pamelius, who had advanced something of this notion before De Marca, rejects this as a deluding distinction, and asserts, "that the people had properly a voice or suffrage of election," and he quotes Bishop Andrews[7] for the same opinion. Yet he does not carry the point so high, as to maintain with Blondel, that it was of unalterable right, but left by God as a thing indifferent, to be ordered by the discretion of the Church, so all things be done honestly and in order. And this seems to have been the opinion of Spalatensis,[8] Richerius,[9] Justellus,[10] Suicerus, and some other learned men of both Churches. Others there are, who

---

[1] Habert. Archieratic. p. 486.
[2] Sixt. Biblioth. lib. v. Annot. 118.
[3] Bellarm. de Clericis, lib. i. c. 7.
[4] Blondel. Apol. p. 379, &c.
[5] Marca de Concord. lib. viii. c. 2. n. 2.
[6] Mason Consecrat. of Bishops, lib. iv. c. 4. p. 159, 160.
[7] Andrews Resp. ad Apol. Bell. c. 13. p. 313. Præsentia Plebis apud Cyprianum includit testimonium de vitâ, nec excludit suffragium de personâ.
[8] Spalat. de Repub. lib. iii. c. 3. n. 42.
[9] Richer. Hist. Con. lib. i. c. 12. n. 18. p. 389.
[10] Justel. Not. in Can. 6. Con. Chalced.

distinguish between the times preceding the council of Nice, and those that followed after; for they think, whatever power was allowed the people in the three first ages, was taken away by that council, and the councils of Antioch and Laodicea, that followed not long after. So Schelstrate[1] in his Dissertations upon the council of Antioch, where he quotes Christianus Lupus and Sirmond for the same opinion. But this is exploded as a groundless fiction, not only by Spalatensis[2] and bishop Pearson,[3] but also by Richerius,[4] Cabassutius,[5] Valesius,[6] Petavius,[7] De Marca,[8] and other learned persons of the Roman communion, who think the fathers of the Nicene council made no alteration in this matter, but left all things as they found them. Some again distinguish between the election of bishops and the other clergy, and say, "the people's consent was only required in the election of bishops, but not in the promotion of the inferior clergy." So Cabassutius,[9] and bishop Beverege,[10] who reckons this so clear a point, that there is no dispute to be made of it. Yet Valesius disputes it, and asserts the contrary,[11] "that anciently presbyters were not to be ordained by the bishop without the consent of the clergy and people." Bishop Stillingfleet, who is one of the last that has considered this matter, gives us his sense in these following observations. First, "That the main ground of the people's interest[12] was founded upon the Apostle's canon, 'that a bishop must be blameless and of good report;' and therefore," he says,[13] "the people's share and concern in elections, even in Cyprian's time, was not to give their votes, but only their testimony concerning the good or ill behaviour of the person." Secondly, "That yet upon this the people assumed the power of elections, and thereby caused great disturbances and disorders in the Church."

---

[1] Schelstr. Not. in Can. 19. Con. Antioch. [2] Spalat. de Repub. lib. iii. c. 3. n. 12. [3] Pearson. Vind. Ignat. par. i. c. 11. p. 324. [4] Richer. Hist. Con. tom. i. c. 2. n. 7. [5] Cabassut. Notit. Con. c. 17. p. 83. [6] Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. [7] Petav. Not. in Synes. p. 56. [8] Marca de Concord. lib. viii. c. 3. n. 4. [9] Cabassut. Notit. Con. c. 36. p. 196. [10] Bevereg. Not. in Can. 6. Con. Chalced. [11] Vales. in Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. Presbyteri olim ab Episcopo ordinari non poterant sine consensu Cleri et Populi. [12] Stillingfleet. Unreason. of Separat. par. 3. n. 25. p. 312. [13] Ibid. p. 316, 317.

Thirdly, "That to prevent these, many bishops were appointed without their choice, and canons made for the better regulating of them." Fourthly, "That when there were Christian magistrates, they did interpose as they thought fit, notwithstanding the popular claim, in a matter of so great consequence to the peace of Church and State." Fifthly, "That upon the alteration of the government of Christendom, the interest of the people was secured by their consent in parliaments; and that, by such consent, the nomination of bishops was reserved to princes, and the patronage of livings to particular persons." In this great variety of judgments and opinions of learned men, it will be no crime to dissent from any of them; and therefore I shall take the liberty to review their opinions, and express impartially what I take to be agreeable, or disagreeable in any of them, to ancient history, and the rules and practice of the Church.

Sect. 2.—The Power of the People equal to that of the Inferior Clergy in the Election of a Bishop.

And here, first of all, it will be proper to observe, that there was no one universal unalterable rule observed in all times and places about this matter; but the practice varied according to the different exigencies and circumstances of the Church; as will evidently appear in the sequel of this history. In the mean time, I conceive the observation, made by De Marca, thus far to be very true: "That whatever power the inferior clergy enjoyed in the election of their bishop, the same was generally allowed to the people, or whole body of the Church, under the regulation and conduct of the metropolitan and synod of provincial bishops." For their power, whatever it was, is spoken of in the very same terms, and expressed in the same words. Some call it consent; others suffrage or vote; others election or choice; but all agree in this, that it was equally the consent, suffrage, vote, election, and choice both of clergy and people. Thus Cyprian observes[1] of Cornelius, "That he

[1] Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 104. Factus est Cornelius Episcopus---De Clericorum penè omnium testimonio, de Plebis, quæ tum adfuit, Suffragio.

was made bishop by the testimony of the clergy, and suffrage of the people;" where it is evident the words testimony and suffrage are equally ascribed both to clergy and people. Socrates,[1] speaking of the election of Chrysostom, says, "he was chosen by the common vote of all, both clergy and people." And Theodoret describes the election of Eustatius, bishop of Antioch, after the same manner, when he tells us,[2] "he was compelled to take the bishopric by the common vote of the bishops and clergy, and all the people." Siricius[3] styles this "the election of the clergy and people;" and Celestin,[4] "the consent and desire of the clergy and people;" and Leo,[5] "both the consent, and election, and suffrage or votes of the people;" who adds, also, "that in case the parties were divided in their votes, then the decision should be referred to the judgment of the metropolitan, who should choose, him who had most votes, and greatest merit to recommend him." From all which, and many other passages, that might be alleged to the same purpose, it is very evident, that the power of the clergy and people was equal in this matter, and that nothing was challenged by the one, that was not allowed to the other also.

SECT. 3.—This Power not barely Testimonial, but Judicial and Elective.

And hence it appears further, that this conjunctive power of clergy and people was not barely testimonial, but, as bishop Andrews and Mr. Mason assert, "a judicial and effective power, by way of proper suffrage and election;" and that as well in the time of Cyprian as afterwards. For Cyprian speaks both of testimony and suffrage belonging to both clergy and people; and says further,[6] "that that is a

---

[1] Socrat. lib. vi. c. 2. Ψηφίσματί κοινῷ ὁμῶ πάντων, κλήρῳ τε καὶ λαῷ.
[2] Theod. lib. i. c. 7. Ψήφῳ κοινῇ κατηναγκασαν ἀρχιερεις τε καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ ἅπας ὁ λεὼς.
[3] Siric. Ep. 1. ad Himerium Taracon. c. 10. Presbyterio vel Episcopatui, si eum Cleri ac Plebis evocaverit electio, non immeritò societur.
[4] Celestin. Ep. ii. c. 5. Nullus invitis detur Episcopus: Cleri, Plebis, et Ordinis consensus et desiderium requiratur.
[5] Leo. M. Ep. 84. ad Anastas. c. 5. Cùm de Summi Sacerdotis electione tractabitur, ille omnibus præponatur, quem Cleri Plebisque consensus concorditer postulàrit; ita ut si in aliam fortè personam partium se vota diviserint, Metropolitani judicio is alteri præferatur, qui majoribus et studiis juvatur et meritis, &c.
[6] Cypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Fratr. Hispan. p. 172. Ordinatio justa et legitima, quæ omnium suffragio et Judicio fuerit examinata.

just and legitimate ordination, which is examined by the suffrage and judgment of all, both clergy and people." So that they were then present at the choice of their bishop, not merely to give testimony concerning his life, but, as bishop Andrews words it, to give their vote and suffrage in reference to his person. Which observation will be further evidenced and confirmed by proceeding with the account of several rules and customs generally observed in these elections.

SECT. 4.—Evidences of this Power from some ancient Rules and Customs of the Church. As first, that no Bishop was to be obtruded on an Orthodox People without their Consent.

1 One of these was, that no bishop was to be obtruded on any orthodox people against their consent. I say, an orthodox people; for in case the majority of them were heretics or scismatics, the practice was different, as will be showed hereafter: but where they were all Catholics, and could agree upon a Catholic and deserving bishop, they were usually gratified in their choice, and no person was to be put upon them against their inclination. Sometimes, the bishops in synod proposed a person, and the people accepted him: sometimes, again, the people proposed, and the bishops consented; and where they were unanimous in a worthy choice, we scarce ever find they were rejected. If they were divided, it was the metropolitan's care to unite and fix them in their choice, but not to obtrude upon them an unchosen person. This we learn from one of Leo's Epistles,[1] where he gives us at once both the Church's rule and practice, and the reasons of it. "In the choice of a bishop," says he, "let him be preferred, whom the clergy aad people do unanimously agree upon and require; if they be divided in their choice, then let the metropolitan give preference to him, who has most votes and most merits:—always provided, that no one be ordained against the will

[1] Leo. Ep. 84. c. 5. Si in aliam fortè personam partium se vota diviserint, Metropolitani judicio is alteri præferatur, qui majoribus et studiis juvatur et meritis: tantùm ut nullùs invitis et non petentibus ordinetur, ne Plebs invita Episcopum non optatum aut contemnat, aut oderit, et fiat minus religiosa quàm convenit, cui non licuerit habere quem voluit.

and desire of the people, lest they contemn or hate their bishop, and become irreligious or disrepectful, when they cannot have him, whom they desired." The transgression of this rule was objected as a great crime to Hilarius Arelatensis, by the Emperor Valentinian the Third,[1] "that he ordained bishops in several places against the will and consent of the people, whom when they would not admit of, because they had not chosen them, he used armed force to settle them in their sees, introducing the preachers of peace by the violence of war." Leo[2] objects the same thing to him, saying, "That he ought to have proceeded by another rule, and first to have required the votes of the citizens, the testimonies of the people, the will of the gentry, and the election of the clergy; for he that was to preside over all, was to be chosen by all." This evidently shows, that the suffrage of the people was then something more than barely testimonial.

Sect. 5.—Secondly. This further confirmed from Examples of the Bishops' complying with the Voice of the People against their own Inclination.

Another argument is, that in many cases the voices of the people prevailed against the bishops themselves, when they happened to be divided in their first proposals. Thus it happened in the famous election of St. Martin, bishop of Tours, which has been mentioned in the last chapter, sect. 3. The people were unanimously for him; Defensor, with a great party of bishops, at first was against him; but the voice of the people prevailed, and the bishops complied and ordained him. Philostorgius gives us such another instance. Demophilus, bishop of Constantinople, with some other bishops suspected of Arianism, meeting at Cyzicum, to ordain a bishop there, the people first made a protestation against them, "that unless they would ana-

---

[1] Novel. 24. ad Calcem. Cod. Theod. Indecenter alios invitis et repugnantibus civibus ordinavit. Qui quidem, quoniam non facilè ab his, qui non elegerant, recipiebantur, manum sibi contrahebat armatam - - - Et ad sedem quietis pacem prædicaturos per bella ducebat. [2] Leo Ep. 89. ad Episc. Vien. Expectarentur certè vota Civium, testimonia Populorum, quæreretur Honoratorum arbitrium, electio Clericorum. . . . Qui præfuturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur.

hematize publicly Aetius and Eunomius, both in word and writing, they should ordain no bishop there:" and when they had complied to do this, they still insisted on their privilege, "that no one should be ordained but one[1] of their own choosing;" which was one, who, as soon as he was ordained, preached the Catholic doctrine of the Ὁμοούσιον, that the Son was of the same substance with the Father. Ancient history will furnish the reader with many other instances of the like nature.

SECT. 6.—Thirdly. From the Manner of the People's Voting at Elections.

Another evidence of the people's power in elections is the manner of their voting, or the way of giving their assent or dissent to the ordination of any person; which was threefold. For either, first, they were unanimous in their vote for or against a man, and then their way was to express their mind by a general acclamation, crying out with one voice, Ἄξιος, or Ἀνάξιος, *Dignus* or *Indignus*, as the word then was, *he is worthy* or *unworthy*. Instances of which form the reader may find in St. Ambrose,[2] St. Austin,[3] Eusebius,[4] Philostorgius,[5] Photius,[6] the author of the Constitutions,[7] and several others. Or else, secondly, they were divided in their choice, and then they expressed their dissent in particular accusations of the parties proposed, and sidings, and sometimes outrageous tumults. St. Chrysostom[8] reflects upon this way in his Books of the Priesthood, when he tells us, "that in those popular solemnities, which were then customarily held for the choice of ecclesiastical rulers, one might see a bishop exposed to as many accusations, as there were heads among the people." And the account that is given not only by Ammianus Marcellinus,[9] but by Socrates,[10] and the other historians, of the tumult raised at Rome in the election of Damasus, shows that the people

---

[1] Philostorg. lib. ix. c. 13. Ὃν ἀυτῶν αἱ ψήφοι προσίταττον.
[2] Ambr. de Dignit. Sacerd. c. 5. In Ordinationibus eorum clamant et dicunt, "Dignus es," et "Justus es."
[3] Aug. Ep. 110. Dignus et Justus est, dictum est vicies.
[4] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 29. Πάντα λαὸν - - - Ἄξιον ἐπιβοῆσαι.
[5] Philostorg. lib. ix. c. 10.
[6] Phot. Cod. 256. p. 1414.
[7] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 4.
[8] Chrys. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. c. 15.
[9] Ammian. lib. xxvii. c. 2.
[10] Socrat. lib. iv. c. 29.

were indulged in something more than barely giving testimony, else they had hardly run into so great a heat and ungovernable tumult. There was also a third way of expressing their consent, which was by subscribing the decree of election for greater security, that no party might pretend afterward that they had not given assent to it. Thus it was in the election of Meletius, bishop of Antioch, who was chosen by common consent both of Catholics and Arians, each party presuming him to be of their own opinion. The election-paper was subscribed by all, Theodoret says,[1] and put into the hands of Eusebius Samosatensis, which Constantius, when Meletius proved a Catholic, demanded to have had destroyed, but with all his menaces he could not extort it from him. St. Austin gives the like account[2] of the election of Eradius, his successor at Hippo, which for some reasons he got done in his own life-time. He first ordered the notaries of the Church to take the acclamations of the people in writing, and then required all that could write to subscribe the instrument themselves. And this was the common way, whenever the metropolitan could not be present at the election; then the decree of the whole Church was drawn up in writing, and carried to him for his consent and approbation. The remains of which custom may still be seen in the ancient *Ordo Romanus*,[3] where there is a form of a decree, which the clergy and people were to sign upon their choice of a bishop, and present it to the metropolitan and the synod, in order to his consecration; in which case, if the metropolitan found him upon examination to be a person every way qualified, as they represented him, he then confirmed and ratified their choice, and so proceeded immediately to his ordination. All which argues, that the people had something of a

---

[1] Theod. lib. ii. c. 31. [2] Aug. Ep. 110. A Notariis Ecclesiæ, sicut cernitis, excipiuntur quæ dicimus, excipiuntur quæ dicitis, et meus sermo, et vestræ acclamationes in terram non cadunt. - - - - Hoc ad ultimum rogo, ut gestis istis dignemini subscribere qui potestis. [3] Ordo Rom. Biblioth. Patr. tom. x. p. 104. Decretum, quod Clerus et Populus firmare (al. formare) debet de electo Episcopo. - - - - Ut omnium nostrûm vota in hanc electionem convenire noscatis, huic Decreto Canonico promptissimâ voluntate singuli manibus propriis roborantes subscripsimus.

decisive power in elections, and that their suffrage was not merely testimonial.

SECT. 7.—4thly. From the Use and Office of Interventors.

This is further evident from the use and office of interventors in the Latin Church, whose business was to promote and procure a speedy election of a new bishop in any vacant see, as I have had occasion to show in another place.[1] For in the Roman and African Churches, upon the vacancy of a bishopric, it was usual for the metropolitan to grant a commission to some of his provincial bishops to go to the vacant Church, and dispose the clergy and people to be unanimous in the choice of a new bishop; and when they were agreed, they petitioned the metropolitan by the interventor to confirm their choice, and with a synod of provincial bishops to come and ordain him, whom they had elected. Or else they drew up an instrument in writing, subscribed both by the interventor and themselves, and presented the new elect bishop to the metropolitan, who ordained him in his own Church. This was the practice of the Roman province in the time of Symmachus and Gregory the Great, as appears from their Epistles, which give directions to the interventors, or visitors, as they call them, concerning their behaviour in the present case. "Let no one," says Symmachus,[2] "draw up an instrument of election without the presence of the visitor, by whose testimony the agreement of the clergy and people may be declared." And Gregory, writing to Barbarus, bishop of Beneventum and visitor of the Church of Palermo, bids him "endeavour to make the clergy and people unanimous in their presentation of a worthy person to be their bishop, who could not[3]

[1] Book ii. chap. xv. [2] Symmach. Ep. 5. c. 6. Decretum sine Visitatoris præsentiâ nemo conficiat, cujus testimonio Clericorum, ac Civium possit unanimitas declarari. [3] Greg. lib. xi. Ep. 16. Dilectio tua Clerum Plebemque ejusdem Ecclesiæ admonere festinet, ut, remoto studio, uno eodemque consensu talem sibi præficiendum expetant Sacerdotem, qui et tanto ministerio dignus valeat reperiri, et venerandis Canonibus nullatenus respuatur. Qui dum fuerit postulatus cum solemnitate Decreti omnium subscriptionibus roborati, et dilectionis tuæ testimonio literarum, ad nos sacrandus occurrat.

be rejected by the canons; and then drawing up their petition in form of a decree, signed with all their hands, and the letters testimonial of the visitor, they should send him to Rome for consecration." Nothing can be plainer, than that here the clergy and people made the choice of their bishop, with the assistance of a visitor or interventor, and then presented him to the metropolitan, who, if he had no canonical exception against him, confirmed their choice, and proceeded to his ordination.

SECT. 8.—5thly. From the Custom of the People's taking Persons, and having them Ordained by Force.

As a further evidence of this power and privilege indulged to the people, it may be observed likewise, that it was customary in those days for the people in many places to lay violent hands upon persons, and bring them by force to the bishop to be ordained. Thus Possidius[1] tells us it was in the ordination of St. Austin, "the people seized him and brought him to the bishop, requiring, with one voice, that he would ordain him presbyter, whilst he in the mean time wept abundantly for the force that was put upon him." Paulinus[2] says the same of himself, "that he was ordained presbyter by force and the irresistible violence of an inflamed and zealous people." And there are many other instances of the like nature.

SECT. 9.—6thly. From the Title of Fathers, which some Bishops upon this Account by Way of Compliment gave to their People.

I observe but one thing more relating to this matter, which was the compliment, that some bishops passed upon their people upon this account, styling them fathers, in regard to the share and influence they had in their designation and election. St. Ambrose himself,[3] speaking to his people, addresses himself to them in this style; "Ye are

---

[1] Poss. Vit. Aug. c. 4. Eum tenuerunt, et ut, in talibus consuetum est, Episcopo ordinandum intulerunt, omnibus id uno consensu et desiderio fieri perficique petentibus, magnoque studio et clamore flagitantibus, ubertim eo flente. [2] Paulin. Ep. 35. inter Epist. August. A Lampio apud Barcilnonam in Hispaniâ, per vim inflammatæ subito Plebis sacratus sum. Vid. Paulin. Ep. 6. ad Severum. p. 101. [3] Ambr. Com. in Luc. lib. viii. c. 17. Vos enim mihi estis parentes, qui Sacerdotium detulistis: Vos, inquam, filii vel parentes, filii singuli, universi parentes.

my fathers, who chose me to be bishop; ye, I say, are both my children and fathers; children in particular, fathers all together." In which words he plainly refers to that providential consent of the people of Milan, who, when they were divided before into several factions, as soon as Ambrose was named, all unanimously conspired together in his election. These are some of those collateral evidences, that may be brought to prove, that anciently the clergy and people joined in a common vote in the election of their bishop, and that their suffrage was something more than testimonial, especially in the fourth and fifth ages, in the Latin Church; where, as De Marca owns, the people's request was chiefly considered.

SECT. 10.—What Power the People had in the Designation of Presbyters.

Nor was this privilege only indulged them in the election of their bishop, but sometimes in the designation of presbyters also. For St. Austin and Paulinus were but to be ordained presbyters, when that forcible constraint, just now spoken of, was laid upon them by the people. Besides St. Jerom[1] says expressly, "that presbyters and the other clergy were as much chosen by the people, as the bishops were." And Possidius[2] notes this to have been both the custom of the Church and St. Austin's practice, in the ordinations of priests and clerks, to have regard to the majority or general consent of Christian people. And Siricius, who speaks the sense and practice of the Roman Church,[3] says, "that when a deacon was to be ordained either presbyter or bishop, he was first to be chosen both by the clergy and people." And therefore I cannot so readily subscribe to the assertion of those learned men, who say, that bishops before their ordination were propounded to the people, but not presbyters or any other of the inferior clergy.

---

[1] Hieron. Ep. 4. ad Rustic. Cùm te vel Populus vel Pontifex Civitatis in Clerum elegerit, agito quæ Clerici sunt. Id. in Ezek. lib. x. c. 33. p. 609. Speculator Ecclesiæ, vel Episcopus vel Presbyter, qui à Populo electus est.

[2] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 21. In ordinandis Sacerdotibus et Clericis consensum majorem Christianorum et Consuetudinem Ecclesiæ sequendam esse arbitrabatur.

[3] Siric. Ep. 1. ad Himer. Tarracon. c. 10. Exinde jam accessu temporum, Presbyterium vel Episcopatum, si eum Cleri ac Plebis evocaverit electio, non immeritò sortietur.

Sect. 11.—Whether the Council of Nice made any Alteration in these Matters.

As to those who assert, that the people were anciently indulged in these matters before the council of Nice, but that their power was abridged by a new decree of that council, they are evidently under a mistake. For it is certain the Nicene Fathers made no alteration in this affair, but left the whole matter as they found it; for though in one of their canons[1] it is said, "that the presence, or at least the consent of all the provincial bishops, and the confirmation or ratification of the metropolitan shall be necessary to the election and ordination of a bishop;" yet that is not said to exclude any ancient privilege that the people enjoyed, but only to establish the rights of metropolitans and provincial bishops, which Meletius, the schismatical Egyptian bishop, had particularly invaded, by presuming to ordain bishops without the authority of his metropolitan, or consent of his fellow-bishops in the provinces of egypt. That nothing else was designed by that canon is evident from this, that the same council, in the synodical epistle written to the Church of Alexandria, expressly mentions the choice of the people, and requires it as a condition of a canonical election. For, speaking of such Meletian bishops as would return to the unity of the Catholic Church, it says, "that when any Catholic bishop died, Meletian bishops might succeed in their room, provided they were worthy, and that the people[2] chose them, and the bishop of Alexandria ratified and confirmed their choice." Our learned bishop Pearson[3] has rightly observed, that Athanasius himself was thus chosen, after the Nicene council was ended; which is a certain argument, that the people's right was not abrogated in that council. The Eusebian party

[1] Con. Nic. can. 4. [2] Con. Nic. Ep. Synod. ap. Theod. lib. i. c. 9. Et Socrat. lib. i. c. 9. Ἐι ἄξιοι φαίνοιντο, καὶ ὁ λαὸς αἱροῖτο, συνεπιψηφίζοντος αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπισφραγιζοντος τοῦ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκόπου. [3] Pearson Vind. Ignat. par. i. c. 11. p. 324. Ed. Antwerp. Eusebiani, qui creationem Athanasii abrogare voluerunt, defectum popularis electionis objiciebant, et Episcopi Ægypti, in synodo congregati, Epistolâ ad omnes Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Episcopos scriptâ, contrarium magnâ animi contentione asseruerunt. --- Quod neque hi neque illi fecissent, si populi suffragia in eligendo Episcopo locum nullum habuissent.

made it an objection against him, "that he had not the choice of the people;" but the bishops of Egypt assembled in synod, in their synodical epistle, do with great earnestness maintain the contrary, asserting, "that the whole multitude of the people of the Catholic Church,[1] as if they had been all united in one soul and body, cried out, requiring Athanasius to be ordained bishop." Whence Gregory Nazianzen[2] also says of him, "that he was brought to the throne of St. Mark,—ψήφῳ τῆς λαῆς παντὸς, *by the suffrage of all the people.*" It were easy to add many other instances and proofs of the like nature to the time of the council of Chalcedon, when the people of Alexandria still enjoyed their ancient privilege, as appears from several passages in Liberatus,[3] who says of Proterius, and some other of their bishops, "that they were chosen by the nobles, and the decree, and voice of all the people." But I shall say no more upon this head, but only allege two canons of the fourth council of Carthage, which comprise the whole practice of the Church in relation to this matter;—the one decreeing,[4] "that the ordination of a bishop should always be by the consent of four parties, the clergy, the laity, the provincial bishops, and the metropolitan, whose presence or authority was principally necessary in all such cases." The other canon[5] orders, "that no bishop shall ordain any clergymen without consulting with his clergy, and asking the consent, approbation, and testimony of his people." This seems to have been the most common and ordinary practice of the Church.

---

[1] Ep. Synod. Con. Alex. ap. Athan. Apol. ii. tom. 2. p. 726. Πᾶς ὁ λαὸς-ν ἀνεβόων, ἔκραζον, αἰτοῦντες Ἀθανάσιον ἐπίσκοπον. [2] Naz. Orat. 21. tom. i. p. 377. [3] Liberat. Breviar. c. 14. Collecti sunt Nobiles Civitatis, ut eum qui esset vitâ et sermone Pontificatu dignus, eligerent. - - - Novissimè in Proterium omnium sententia declinavit. Id. c. 15. Scripsit Imperator Leo Duci Alexandria Stilæ, ut pelleret quidem ab Episcopatu modis omnibus Timotheum, inthronizaret autem alium Decreto Populi, qui synodum vindicaret. [4] Con. Carth. iv. c. 1. Cum consensu Clericorum et Laicorum, et conventu totius Provinciæ Episcoporum, maximèque Metropolitani vel auctoritate vel præsentiâ ordinetur Episcopus. [5] Ibid. Can. 22. Ut Episcopus sine consilio Clericorum suorum Clericos non ordinet; ita ut Civium assensum, et conniventiam, et testimonium quærat.

Sect. 12.—Some Exceptions to the General Rule. First, In Case the greatest Part of the Church were Heretics or Schismatics.

But then, as all general rules have their exceptions, so it cannot be denied but that this rule varied sometimes, or at least had its limitations and restrictions: and I shall not do justice to the reader, nor the subject neither, unless I mention those also. Here therefore we are to observe, in the first place, that this rule did not hold, when the greatest part of any Church were turned heretics or schismatics. For in that case, had elections been made by the general suffrage of the people, none but heretical or schismatical bishops must have been ordained. And therefore in the time of the great prevalency of Arianism, and the long schism of the Donatists, the Church did not tie herself always to act precisely by this rule. We find it objected by the Donatists in the collation of Carthage,[1] "that the Catholics made bishops in many places, where they had no people;" that is, no Catholic people, for they were all Donatists; consequently those bishops were ordained not only without, but against the consent of the people. And this I take to be the case of those bishops mentioned in the seventeenth and eighteenth canons of the council of Antioch; one of which says, "That if any bishop is ordained to preside over a people, and does not take upon him his office, and go to the Church to which he is ordained, he shall be excommunicated, till he complies, or a provincial synod determines otherwise about him;" and the other says, "If such a bishop absents from his diocese, not by his own default, but διά την τῶ λαῶ παραίτησιν, *because the people refuse to receive him*, in that case he shall be honoured as a bishop, though not admitted to his own Church." These canons were made at a time, when the Arian faction had raised great commotions in the Church, which probably made some bishops unwilling to go to their Churches, and others could not be admitted, because the faction strongly prevailed against them; and in both of them, it is supposed, the ordinations were made without asking the people's

[1] Collat. Carth. l. c. 182. Petilianus Episcopus dixit: Immò crebros ubi habes Episcopos, sanè et sine populis habes.

consent; of which practice we have frequent instances in ecclesiastical history in cases of the same nature.

SECT. 13.—2dly. In Case of Ordaining Bishops to far distant Places, or Barbarous Nations.

Another exception to the rule was, when bishops were to be ordained for very distant countries, or barbarous nations. When Athanasius ordained Frumentius, bishop of the Indies at Alexandria, as the historians[1] report, no one can imagine that he had the formal consent, though he might have the presumptive approbation, of all his people. As neither can we suppose the bishop of Tomi, in Scythia, to be chosen by his people, when he was the only bishop[2] in all that region, and commonly ordained at Constantinople, as, by the twenty-eighth canon of the council of Chalcedon, the bishops of barbarous nations were appointed to be.

SECT. 14.—3dly. In Case an Interventor or any other Bishop intruded himself into any See without the Consent of a Provincial Synod.

In case an interventor, or visitor, who was sent to procure a speedy election in any vacant see, got himself settled in the see, by the interest, which he had gained in the people during his administration, yet he was not allowed to continue in the possession of that see, though he had made never so strong a party among the people, or had the consent of them all; as appears from a canon of the fifth council of Carthage[3], which is also inserted into the Code of the African Church. The case was the same with any vacant bishops,—Ἐπίσκοποι σχολάζοντες,—as the canons call them, who were ordained to such places as would not receive them. If any of them intruded themselves into any vacant Church, without the consent of the metropolitan, and a provincial synod, they were to be rejected, though all the people were unanimous in choosing them; as the coun-

[1] Ruffin. lib. i. c. 9. Socrat. lib. i. c. 19. Theodoret. lib. i. c. 23.
[2] Sozom. lib. vii. c. 19. [3] Con. Carth. v. c. 8. Placuit, ut nulli Intercessori licitum sit, Cathedram, cui Intercessor datus est, quibuslibet Populorum studiis, vel seditionibus retinere. Vid. Cod. Can. Eccl. Afr. c. 75.

cil of Antioch decreed, in express terms,[1] against such invaders:—"If," say they, "a vacant bishop transfers himself into a vacant Church, and seizes the throne by stealth, without the authority of a full synod of the province, he shall be discarded, though all the people, upon whom he thrust himself, should agree in the choice of him." The same council has another canon,[2] which prohibits any bishop to remove from one diocese to another, either of his own accord, or by the compulsion of the people; which plainly implies, that in all such cases no regard was had to the choice of the people, when they pretended to act without the concurrence of a provincial synod.

SECT. 15.—4thly. In Case of Factions and Divisions among the People.

When the people were divided in their choice, and could not unanimously agree upon any one, then, to prevent further disputes, and the mischievous consequences of faction and division, it was usual for the metropolitan and the synod to choose an indifferent person, whom no party had named, and prefer him before all the competitors of the people. And this was usually done with good success; for the people commonly were ashamed of their own choice, and universally acquiesced in this. Sidonius Apollinarius gives us a famous instance, in the ordination of John, bishop of Chalons. A triumvirate of competitors, whose characters were not extraordinary, had, by different interests, drawn the people into three very great factions; to remedy which the metropolitan, privately consulting with his fellow-bishops, but taking none of the people into council, ordained this John, to the surprise of them all; but, as our author[3] observes, "it was managed with that prudence, that though the advice of the people was not taken, yet

---

[1] Con. Antioch. c. 16. Ἐι τις ἐπίσκοπος σχολάζων ἐπὶ σχολάζουσαν ἐκκλησίαν ἑαυτὸν ἐπιῤῥίψας, ὑφαρπάζει τὸν θρόνον δίχα συνόδου τελείας: τοῦτον ἀπόβλητον εἶναι, ἂν εἰ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς, ὃν ὑφάρπαζεν, ἕλοιτο αὐτον. [2] Ibid. Can. 21. Επίσκοπον ἀπὸ παροικίας ἑτέρας εἰς ἑτέραν μὴ μεθίστασθαι, μήτε αὐθαιρέτως ἐπιῤῥίπτοντα ἑαυτὸν, μήτε ὑπὸ λαῶν εκβιαζομένον. [3] Sidon. lib. iv. Ep. 25. Strepitu furentis turbæ despecto, sanctum Johannem, stupentibus factiosis, erubescentibus malis, acclamantibus bonis, reclamantibus nullis, collegam sibi consecraveie.

the holy man was ordained, to the astonishment of the factious, and confusion of the wicked, with the general acclamations of the good, and the contradictions and oppositions of none." And this was a common method in case of incurable divisions among the people.

SECT. 16.—5thly. The Emperors sometimes interposed their Authority to prevent Tumults in the like Cases.

Sometimes the emperors interposed their authority, and themselves nominated the person, whom they would have to be ordained bishop; when they found, by experience, what dangerous tumults these popular elections raised among the people. Thus it was in the case of Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, who was nominated by Theodosius only. For the people were not so much as consulted in the matter, but the emperor ordered the bishops to give him in a catalogue of fit persons, reserving the power of election entirely to himself. Nay, when some of the bishops objected against Nectarius, "that he was but a catechumen, and unbaptized," the emperor, notwithstanding, persisted in his choice, and the bishops complied, and immediately baptized and ordained him, as Sozomen[1] informs us. Socrates takes notice of the same prerogative made use of by Theodosius Junior, upon the like occasion, who nominated Nestorius to the see of Constantinople," διὰ τὰς κενοσπουδίας, *by reason of factious and vain-glorious persons*[2] in the Church." And, for the like reason, the same author[3] tells us, upon another vacancy, to prevent tumults in the election, he gave his mandate to the bishops to enthrone Proclus in the Church. De Marca[4] will furnish the reader with other instances, and ecclesiastical history with more, to the same purpose.

SECT. 17.—6thly. The People sometimes restrained to the Choice of One out of Three, which were nominated by the Bishops.

Sometimes, again, we find the people and clergy were confined in their choice, to take one out of three, that were

---

[1] Sozom. lib. vii. c. 8. [2] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 29. [3] Idem. lib. vii. c. 40. [4] Marca de Concord. lib. viii. c. 9. n. 8.

first nominated by the bishops in council. Thus it was in France, in the time of the second council of Arles, Anno 452, when that council made an order about elections to this purpose: "That in the ordination of a bishop[1] this rule should be observed; the bishops shall nominate three, out of which the clergy and people shall have power to choose one." Other laws[2] appointed the clergy and people to nominate three, and the metropolitan and provincial bishops to cast lots, which of the three should be ordained; which was the rule of the Spanish Church in the time of the council of Barcelona, Anno 599.

SECT. 18.—Lastly, by Justinian's Laws the Elections were confined to the *Optimates*, and the Inferior People wholly excluded.

We find also, in Justinian's laws, that a considerable alteration was made in this affair, wherever those laws took place. For thereby the inferior sort of the common people were wholly cut off from having any concern in these elections, which were now confined to the clergy, and the *Optimates*, or persons of better rank and quality in every Church. For so, by two of his Novels,[3] it is expressly provided, "That when a bishop is to be ordained for any city, the clergy and chief men of the city shall meet, and nominate three persons, drawing up an instrument, and inserting therein upon their oath, that they choose them neither for any gift, nor promise, nor friendship, nor any other cause, but because they know them to be of the true Catholic faith, and of honest life, and good learning, &c. That out of these three, one that is best qualified may be

[1] Con. Arelat. ii. c. 54. Placuit in Ordinatione Episcopi hunc ordinem custodiri, ut tres ab Episcopis nominentur, de quibus Clerici vel Cives ergaunum habeant elegendi potestatem. [2] Con. Barcinon. can. 3. [3] Justin. Novel. 123. c. 1. Sancimus, quoties opus fuerit Episcopum ordinari, Clericos et Primates Civitatis, cui Episcopus ordinandus est, mox in tribus personis decreta facere, propositis Sacrosanctis Evangeliis, periculo suarum animarum dicentes in ipsis decretis, quia neque propter aliquam donationem, neque propter aliquam promissionem, aut amicitiam, aut aliam quamlibet causam; sed scientes eos rectæ et Catholicæ Fidei, et honestæ esse vitæ, et literas nôsse, hos elegerunt: - - - - Ut ex tribus illis personis melior ordinetur, electione et judicio ordinantis. See also Novel. 137. c. 2. et Cod. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 42.

chosen by the discretion and judgment of the ordainer." De Marca thinks the council of Laodicea long before made a canon to the same purpose, forbidding the elections of the clergy to be committed "Τοῖς ὄχλοις, *vili plebeculæ*," as De Marca renders it,[1] that is, *to the common and inferior sort of people*. But it is not certain the canon intended the prohibition in that sense; or if it did, it was of no force; for the people continued their ancient practice for some ages after that council. However upon the whole matter it appears, that this power of the people did never so universally obtain, but that it was limited in several cases by certain restrictions, and varied according to the different state of times and nations.

SECT. 19.—How and when Princes and Patrons came to have the chief Power of Elections.

At last, upon the breaking of the Roman Empire, the Gothic kings in France and Spain were generally complimented with a share in these elections, and their consent was as necessary, as any other, to the ordination of bishops within their dominions. By which means their power quickly increased into a prerogative of nominating solely, and all others had little else to do but to accept their nominations; which the reader, that is curious in this matter, may find discoursed at large by De Marca,[2] in his account of the change, that was made in the French and Spanish Churches in after ages, which it is none of my business here further to pursue. As to the power of nomination in inferior patrons, it is generally agreed by learned men,[3] that it came in upon the division of dioceses into distinct parishes, and the founding of Churches in country places. For to give greater encouragement to such pious and useful works, the founder of any Church, who settled an endowment upon it, was allowed to retain the right of presentation to himself, to nominate a fit clerk to the bishop for his approbation. That, which led the way to this practice, was a decree of the

[1] Con. Laodic. c. 13. Marca de Concord. lib. viii. c. 6. n. 8. [2] Marc de Concord. lib. viii. c. 9 et 10. [3] See Stillingfleet Unreas. of Sep p. 326.

first council of Orange, Anno 441; wherein this power and privilege was first granted to bishops, "that if any bishop was disposed to found a Church in the territory of another bishop, the bishop of the diocese, where the Church was built, should consecrate it; reserving to the founder[1] the right of nominating such clerks, as he should desire to have in his own Church, whom the bishop of the diocese should ordain at his request; or if they were already ordained, he should allow them to continue without any molestation." And this canon is repeated in the second council of Arles,[2] in the editions of Sirmond and Labbe, though it be wanting in some others. After this, by the laws of Justinian, all founders of Churches and their heirs are allowed to nominate their own clerks, upon the right of patronage, to those Churches. "If any man builds an oratory," says one of his Novels,[3] "and either he or his heirs are minded to have clerks ordained thereto; if they allow maintenance to them, and they be worthy persons, such as they nominate shall be ordained." And the bishop has no power to ordain any other, unless the persons so nominated be unqualified by the canons. Another Novel[4] allows the bishop liberty to examine them, and judge of their qualifications; but, if he finds them worthy, he is obliged to ordain them, having in that case no power to refuse them. They, who would see more of this matter, may consult our learned bishop Stillingfleet,[5] who gives an account of the progress of it in future ages; which being foreign to my subject, I return to the business of elections in the ancient Church, and proceed to give an account of the several qualifications that were necessarily required in persons to be elected and ordained to any office or dignity in the Church.

---

[1] Con. Arausican. i. c. 9. Reservatâ Ædificatori Episcopo hâc gratiâ, ut quos desiderat Clericos in re suâ videre, ipsos ordinet is in cujus civitatis territorio est; vel si jam ordinati sunt, ipsos habere acquiescat. [2] Coq. Arelat. ii. Anno 452. can. 36. [3] Novel. 123. c. 18. Si quis oratorii domum ædificaverit, et voluerit in eâ Clericos ordinare aut ipse, aut ejus Hæredes: si expensas ipsis Clericis ministrant, et dignos denominant, denominatos ordinari. Si verò qui ab eis eliguntur, tanquam indignos prohibent Sacræ Regulæ ordinari, tunc Episcopus quoscunque putaverit meliores, ordinari procuret. [4] Novel. 57. c. 2. [5] Stilling. Unreas. of Separ. par. 3. p. 327.

CHAP. III.

the Examination and Qualifications of Persons to be Ordained to any Office of the Clergy in the Primitive Church. And first, of their Faith and Morals.

ECT. 1.—Three Inquiries made about Persons to be Ordained, respecting, st, Their Faith; 2dly, Their Morals; 3dly, Their outward Quality and Condition.

BEFORE any person could regularly be elected, or ordained any clerical office in the Church, the electors and ordiners were obliged to make several inquiries concerning n, which I think may be reduced to these three heads; e examination of his faith, his morals, and his outward ate and condition in the world. The two first of these ey were most strict in canvassing and examining, because ey were more essential and necessary to the ministry; t the third they did not omit, because the peculiar state those times did more especially require it. For then en were tied by the laws of the empire to bear the offices the state, according to their quality and substance, and ose offices were commonly inconsistent with the offices the Church; which made it necessary to inquire, before en were ordained, whether they were under any obligaon to the state, or obnoxious to any distinct power; for ar the Church should seem to encroach upon other men's ghts, or bring trouble upon herself, by having her clergy called to a secular life again.

SECT. 2.—The Rule and Method of Examining their Faith and Learning.

The trial of their faith and orthodoxy, under which I also mprehend their learning, was made three ways; partly obliging the electors to give in their public testimony of em; partly by obliging the persons elected to answer to rtain interrogatories, or questions of doctrine, that were it to them; and partly by making them subscribe a body articles, or confession of faith, at the time of their ordi-

nation. By a law of Justinian's[1] the electors themselves were to declare upon oath in the instrument or decree of election, if it were a bishop that was chosen, that they knew him to be man of the true Catholic faith, and of good life and conversation, &c. And by the same law the bishop to be ordained was required to give in a libel, or form of confession of his faith, subscribed with his own hand; and to repeat the form of prayer used at the oblation of the holy eucharist, and at baptism, with the other prayers of the Church. Which was an intimation, that he allowed and approved the liturgy or public service of the Church. The fourth council of Carthage prescribes a particular form of examination by way of interrogatories to the bishop, who was to be ordained, which is too long to be here inserted; but it consists chiefly of such questions as relate to the articles of the creed; and doctrines levelled against the most noted heresies,[2] that either then were, or lately had been predominant in the Church. Orders also are there given to examine, whether the candidate be well instructed in the law of God, and able to expound the sense of Scripture, and be thoroughly exercised in the doctrines of the Church. By which we may judge what due precaution was then taken, to admit none but persons rightly qualified, as to their faith, to the chief administrations of the Church.

SECT. 3.—The irregular Ordination of Synesius considered.

Upon which consideration it has seemed very difficult to some learned men, to account for the practice and conduct of Theophilus of Alexandria, in ordaining Synesius, at the same time that he professed he could not yet believe the doctrine of the resurrection, and some other articles of the Christian Faith. Baronius,[3] and Habertus,[4] and our learned

---

[1] Justin. Novel. 137. n. 2. Quemque ipsorum jurare secundum divina eloquia, et ipsis psephismatibus inscribi - - - Quod scientes ipsos rectæ et Catholicæ Fidei et honestæ vitæ, ipsos elegerint. Ibid. Exigi etiam ante omnia ab eo qui ordinandus est, libellum ejus propriâ subscriptione complectentem quæ ad rectam ejus fidem pertinent. Enunciari etiam ab ipso et sanctam oblationis formulam, quæ in sanctâ communione fit, et eam quæ fit in baptismate precationem, et reliquas deprecationes. [2] Con. Carth. 4. c. 1.
[3] Baron. an. 410. tom. v. p. 515. [4] Habert. Archieratic. p. 500.

bishop Taylor[1] reckon, he only dissembled, and used this stratagem to avoid being ordained. But had this been the case, it had still been a just canonical exception against him; for the canons[2] forbid the ordination of any one, who accuses himself as guilty of any heinous crime, whether his accusation be true or false; for he proves himself guilty either by confessing a truth, or at least by telling a lie about it. But indeed the case of Synesius was no feigned case, for he spake the real sense of his soul; as appears not only from what the historian[3] says of it, but from the account, which he himself gives in one of his Epistles[4] to his brother Euoptius: "You know," says he, "that philosophy teaches the contrary to many of those generally-received doctrines. Therefore I cannot persuade myself, that the soul is postnate to the body; I cannot say, that the world and all its parts shall be dissolved; I look upon the resurrection to be *ἱερόν τι καὶ ἀπόῤῥητον, a sort of mystical and ineffable thing*, and am far from assenting to the vulgar opinions about it.—And now being called to the priesthood, I would not dissemble these things, but testify them both before God and man." This asseveration seems too solemn and serious to be the speech of one, who was only acting a part, and dissembling his opinion; and therefore it is more probable, that he was in earnest, as Lucas Holstenius[5] more fully shows in a peculiar dissertation upon this subject against Baronius. Valesius,[6] to vindicate Theophilus, says, Synesius altered his opinions before he was ordained; but that is more than can be proved. The best account of the thing is that, which is given by Holstenius, "that it was the man's admirable virtues, and excellent qualifications in other respects, and a great want of fit men in those difficult times, that encouraged Theophilus to ordain him, in hopes that God would enlighten his mind,

[1] Taylor Duct. Dubit. book iii. c. ii. p. 495. [2] Con. Valentin. c. 4. Quicunque sub ordinatione vel Diaconatûs, vel Presbyterii, vel Episcopatûs, mortali crimine se dixerint esse pollutos, à supradictis ordinationibus esse submovendos, reos scilicet vel veri confessione, vel mendacio falsitatis. [3] Evagr. lib. i. c. 15. Ὅυπω τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀνατάσεως παραδεχόμενον, &c. [4] Synes. Ep. 105. p. 397. [5] Holsten. Dissert. 3. de Synesio, ap. Vales. Not. in Theodor. p. 203. [6] Vales. Not. in Evagr. lib. i. c. 15. It Petav. Vit. Synes. p. 4.

and not suffer so excellent a person long to labour under such errors in religion." But the fairest colours, that can be put upon it, will hardly justify a fact so contrary to the rules of the Church. The instance was singular, and never made a precedent, or drawn into imitation; the general practice of the Church being, as has been showed, to examine men's orthodoxy, and require their assent and subscriptions to the rule of faith before their ordination.

SECT. 4.—A strict Inquiry made into the Morals of such as were to be Ordained.

Their next inquiry was into the morals of the person to be ordained; and here the examination was very strict and accurate. For then the custom was generally to ordain such only, as were known to all the people, and of whose life and character they were satisfied, and could bear testimony to them. "The bishops and presbyters, who preside over us," says Tertullian,[1] "are advanced to that honour only by public testimony." "The law is," says Cyprian,[2] "to choose bishops in the presence of the people, who have perfect knowledge of every man's life, and are acquainted with the tenour of their actions by their conversation."

SECT. 5.—For which Reason no Stranger to be Ordained in a Foreign Church.

Upon which account the laws forbad the ordination of strangers in any Church, to which they did not belong. Optatus[3] makes it an objection against the Donatists, that in the Roman see they never had a bishop, who was a citizen of Rome, but still their succession in that city was supplied by Africans and strangers. Whereas, on the contrary, he challenges[4] them to show, when ever the Church at any time brought a Frenchman or a Spaniard into Afric; or ordained a stranger to a people, that knew nothing of him.

---

[1] Tertul. Apol. c. 39. Præsident apud nos probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti. [2] Cypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. p. 172. Episcopus deligatur Plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissimè novit, et uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit. [3] Optat. lib. ii. p. 48. Quid est hoc, quod pars vestra in Urbe Romæ Episcopum Civem habere non potuit? Quid est quod toti Afri et Peregrini in illâ Civitate sibi successisse noscuntur. [4] Ibid. p. 51. Nunquid nos adduximus Hispanum aut Gallum? Aut nos ordinavimus ignorantibus Peregrinum?

In the civil law we have a constitution of Honorius, the emperor,[1] to this purpose, "That no clerks should be ordained out of any other possession or village, but only that where their Church was." Or if any one thinks that decree was made rather for reasons of state, he may read the same in the canons of the Church; as in the council of Eliberis, which decrees,[2] "That no stranger, baptized in a foreign country, should be ordained out of the province, where he was baptized, because his life and conversation could not be known." And this rule was generally observed, except in some extraordinary cases, when either public fame had made a man eminent and noted over all the world; or there were some particular reasons for going against the rule, of which I have given an account in another place. See book ii. c. x. sect. 3.

SECT. 6.—Nor any One who had done public Penance in the Church.

The strictness of this examination, as to men's morals, will appear further from this,—that the commission of any scandalous crime, for which a man was obliged to do penance in the Church, did for ever after, according to the rules and discipline of those times, render that person irregular and incapable of holy orders. For though they granted pardon and absolution and lay-communion to all offenders, that submitted to the discipline of public penance, yet they thought it not proper to admit such to clerical dignities, but excluded them from the orders and promotions of the Church. At least it was thus in most of the western Churches in the fourth and fifth centuries, as appears from the Latin writers of those ages. The Epistles of Siricius and Innocent show it to have been the practice of the Roman Church in their time. For Siricius says,[3] "No lay-

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. ii. de Episc. leg. 33. Clerici non ex aliâ possessione vel vico, sed ex eo ubi Ecclesiam esse constiterit, ordinentur.
[2] Con. Eliber. c. 24. Omnes qui peregrè fuerint baptizati, eo quod eorum minimè sit cognita vita, placuit, ad Clerum non esse promovendos in alienis Provinciis. [3] Siric. Ep. i. ad Himer. Tarracon. c. 14. Post pœnitudinem et reconciliationem nulli unquam Laico liceat honorem Clericatûs adipisci: quia quamvis sint omnium peccatorum contagione mundati, nulla tamen debent gerendorum Sacramentorum instrumenta suscipere, qui dudum fuerint vasa vitiorum.

man, after public penance and reconciliation, was to be admitted to the honour of the clergy: because though they were cleansed from the contagion of all their sins, yet they ought not to touch the instruments of the sanctuary, who themselves before had been the instruments and vessels of sin." The letters of Innocent[1] are to the same purpose. And so for the French Churches we have the testimony of Gennadius[2] and the second council of Arles,[3] and Agde;[4] and for the Spanish Churches a canon of the first council of Toledo,[5] which allows not penitents to be ordained, except in case of necessity, and then only to the offices of the inferior orders, door-keepers and readers. The practice of the African Churches is evident from the fourth council of Carthage,[6] which decrees, "that no penitent should be ordained, though he was a good man at the present: and if any such was ordained by the bishop's ignorance, not knowing his character, he should be deposed, because he did not declare, that he had been a penitent, at the time of his ordination." By this we may understand what Optatus means, when speaking of the Donatists, who made some of the Catholic children do public penance in the Church, he says, "they thereby gave them a wound, which was intended[7] to cut them off from the benefit of ordination;" plainly referring to this rule in the Church, that he, who had done public penance, was thereby made incapable of ordination; which seems also to be St. Austin's meaning, when speaking of a Christian astrologer, who had done penance for his fault, he says,[8] "his conversion, perhaps, might

---

[1] Innoc. Ep. 22. c. 3. Ubi pœnitentiæ remedium necessarium est illic, Ordinationis honorem locum habere non posse. [2] Gennad. de Eccl. Dogm. c. 73. [3] Con. Arelat. ii. c. 25. [4] Con. Agath. c. 43. De Pœnitentibus nullus Clericus ordinetur. [5] Con. Tolet. i. c. 2. Pœnitentes non admittantur ad Clerum, nisi tantùm necessitas aut usus exegerit, et tunc inter Ostiarios deputentur, vel inter Lectores. [6] Con. Carth. 4. c. 68. Ex Pœnitentibus (quamvis sit bonus) Clericus non ordinetur. Si per ignorantiam Episcopi factum fuerit, deponatur à Clero, quia se Ordinationis tempore non prodidit fuisse pœnitentem. [7] Optat. lib. ii. p. 59. Invenistis pueros, de pœnitentiâ sauciastis, ne aliqui ordinari potuissent. [8] Aug. Append. Enarrat. Psal. 61. Posset videri, quia sic conversus est, Clericatum quærere in Ecclesiâ. Pœnitens est; non quærit nisi solam misericordiam. Vid. Aug. Ep. 50. ad Bonifac. p. 87.

make some think, he intended to get an office among the clergy of the Church: but no," says he, "he is a penitent; he seeks nothing more but only a pardon and absolution:" meaning, that a person in his circumstances could not pretend to sue for orders by the rules and canons of the Church. But we are to note, that this is always to be understood of public penance, not of private; for the council of Girone or Gerunda, in Catalonia, expressly makes this distinction[1] between public penance in the Church, and private penance in time of sickness; making the one to incapacitate men from taking orders, but not the other. And in all other canons, where this distinction is not expressed, it is always to be understood. For it was only that penance, which left some public mark of disgrace upon men, which unqualified them for the orders of the Church. But this rule might be dispensed with in extraordinary cases; and there are some learned men, who think it was not so generally insisted on in the three first ages of the Church: but Origen[2] speaks of it, as the rule of the Church in his time.

SECT. 7.—No Murderer to be Ordained, nor Adulterer, nor One that had lapsed in Time of Persecution.

As to particular crimes, there were a great many that unqualified men, whether they had done public penance for them or not. Such as the three great crimes of murder, adultery, and lapsing in time of persecution. The council of Toledo[3] sets murder in the front of those sins, which exclude men from holy orders. The crimes of fornication and adultery are noted upon the same account by those called the Apostolical Canons,[4] the council of Neo-Cæsarea,[5] the council of Nice,[6] Eliberis,[7] and several others. Nay, the council of Neo-Cæsarea goes a little further, and decrees,[8] that if any man's wife committed adultery, whilst he was a

---

[1] Con. Gerundens. an. 517. c. 9. Qui ægritudinis languore depressus, pœniteutiæ benedictionem, quam viaticum deputamus, per Communionem acceperit; et postmodum reconvalescens caput pœnitentiæ in Ecclesiâ publicè non subdiderit; si prohibitis vitiis non detinetur obnoxius, admittatur ad Clerum. [2] Cont, Cels. lib. iii. p. 143. [3] Con. Tolet. 1 can. 2. [4] Canon. Apost. c. 61. [5] Con. Neo-Cæs. c. 9 et 10. [6] Con. Nic. c. 2. [7] Con. Eliber. c. 30. [8] Con. Neo-Cæo. c. 8.

layman, he should not be admitted to any ecclesiastical function. Or if she committed adultery, when he was in office, he must give her a bill of divorce and put her away; otherwise be degraded from his office. As to the crime of lapsing and sacrificing in time of persecution, Origen[1] assures us, it was the custom of the Church in his time to exclude such, as were guilty of it, from all ecclesiastical power and government. And Athanasius[2] says the same, "that they were allowed the privilege of repentance, but not to have any place among the clergy." Or, if any were ignorantly ordained, they were to be deposed, as soon as they were discovered, by a rule of the great council of Nice.[3] Which was no new rule, but the ancient rule of the whole Catholic Church; for Cyprian[4] says, it was agreed upon at Rome, and in Afric, and by the bishops of the whole world, "that such men might be admitted to repentance; but should be kept back from the ordinations of the clergy and the honour of the priesthood." Upon this account the Arians themselves, though they were not much given to act by rules, sometimes thought fit to deny men ordination; as Athanasius[5] and Socrates[6] say they did by Asterius, the sophist, whom they would not ordain, because he had sacrificed in time of persecution. But they were far from being constant to this rule; for if Philostorgius[7] says true, the leading bishops of the Arian party, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nice, Leontius of Antioch, Antonius of Tarsus, Menophantus of Ephesus, Numenius, Eudoxius, Alexander, and Asterius of Cappadocia, all sacrificed in the Diocletian persecution. But then it must be owned, that some of these were ordained bishops in the Church, before the Arian heresy began to appear; whence we must conclude, that either the bishops, who ordained them, knew

[1] Origen. cont. Cels. lib. iii. p. 145. [2] Athan. Ep. ad Ruffin. tom. ii. p. 41. [3] Con. Nic. c. 10. [4] Cypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. p. 174. Cùm jampridem nobiscum, et cum omnibus omnino Episcopis in toto mundo constitutis, etiam Cornelius, collega noster--- decreverit, ejusmodi homines ad pœnitentiam quidem agendam posse admitti; ab Ordinatione autem Cleri, atque Sacerdotali Honore prohiberi. [5] Athan. de Synod. Arim. et Seleuc. tom. i. p. 887. [6] Socrat. lib. i. c. 36. [7] Philostorg. lib. ii. c. 14.

nothing of their lapsing; or else, that the Church herself sometimes granted dispensations in this case also. Baronius[1] and some others lay it to the charge of Eusebius, the historian, "that he sacrificed in time of persecution." Petavius,[2] and Huetius,[3] and Mr. Pagi,[4] bring the same charge against Origen out of Epiphanius, the first reporter of the story; whilst Valesius[5] and du Pin[6] undertake to vindicate the reputation of Origen from so foul an aspersion. And Hanckius[7] and Dr. Cave[8] do the same for Eusebius. I will not interpose in these controversies, but only observe, that if the accusations brought against those two persons were true, the consequence must be, either that persons who had lapsed might be ordained, or at least continue in their orders undeposed, when the Church saw fit to dispense with her ordinary rule; which probably was not so strict, but that it might admit of some relaxation, when proper occasions and cases extraordinary seemed to require it.

Sect. 8.—No Usurer, or seditious Person.

Another crime, which unqualified men for orders in those times, was sedition or rebellion; for he, that stood convicted of treasonable practices, was never to be ordained. This appears from the fourth council of Carthage,[9] which joins the seditious and usurers together, and excludes them both from ordination. As to the crime of usury, I shall not here stand to explain the nature of it, which will be done in a more convenient place,[10] but only observe, that this crime, in the sense in which the ancients condemned it, was of such an odious and scandalous nature, as to debar men, that had been guilty of it, from the honour and privilege of ordination. Whence Gennadius,[11] speaking of the practice of the Latin Church, and the qualifications required in persons to be ordained, says, "they must not be men con-

---

[1] Baron. ad. an. 335. n. 8. [2] Petav. Animadvers. in Epiphan, Hær. 64. n. 2. [3] Huet. Origenian. lib. i. c. 4. [4] Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 251. n. 6. [5] Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. vi. c. 39. [6] Du Pin Bibliotheque, tom. i. p. 444. [7] Hanckius de Scriptor. Byzantin. par. i. c. 1. n. 158. [8] Cave. Hist. Liter. vol. i. p. 128. [9] Con. Carth. iv. c. 67. Seditionarios nunquam ordinandos Clericos, sicut nec Usurarios. [10] Book vi. [11] Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm. c. 73. Neque illum qui usuras accepisse convincitur.

victed of taking usury." In the Greek Church, at least in the province of Cappadocia, the rule seems not to have been altogether so strict: for St. Basil's Canons[1] do not absolutely exclude such from the ministry, but allow them to be ordained, provided they first gave away to the poor what they had gained by usury, and promised not to exercise it for the future.

SECT. 9.—Nor One who had voluntarily dismembered his own Body.

Another crime, which made a man irregular, and debarred him from the privilege of ordination, was the disfiguring or dismembering of his own body. If any man indeed happened to be born an eunuch, there was no law against his ordination; for Eusebius[2] says, Dorotheus, presbyter of Antioch, was an eunuch from his mother's womb. And Socrates[3] and Sozomen say of Tigris, presbyter of Constantinople, that he was made an eunuch by a barbarian master. Or if a man had suffered the loss of any member by the cruelty of the persecutors; as many confessors in the Diocletian persecution had their right eyes bored out, and their left legs enfeebled; in that case there was no prohibition of their ordination, except they were utterly incapacitated from doing the office of ministers, by being made blind, or deaf, or dumb. For so those called the Apostolical Canons[4] determined; "a man, that hath lost an eye, or is maimed in his leg, may be ordained bishop, if he be otherwise worthy. For it is not any imperfection of body, that defiles a man, but the pollution of his soul. Yet, if a man is deaf or blind, he shall not be made bishop; not because he is polluted, but because he will not be able to perform the duties of his function." The council of Nice adds a third case, in which it was lawful to ordain dismembered persons; which was, when in case of a mortal distemper the physicians thought it necessary to cut off one limb of the body to save the whole. All

[1] Basil. can. 14. ap. Beveneg. Pandect. tom. ii.
[2] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 32.
[3] Socrat. lib. vi. c. 15. Sozom. lib. viii. c. 24.
[4] Canon. Apost. c. 76 et 77.

these were excepted cases, and the prohibition of the canons did not extend to them; but the crime was, when any one dismembered himself in health, as the Nicene canon[1] words it; such an one was not to be ordained, or if he was ordained, when he committed the fact, he was to be deposed. The Apostolical Canons[2] give this reason for it, "because such an one is in effect a self-murderer, and an enemy of the workmanship of God." Nor was it any excuse in this case, that a man made himself an eunuch out of a pretended piety, or to avoid fornication. For such were liable to the penalty of the canon, as well as any others; which is noted by Gennadius[3] and the council of Arles.[4] And indeed the first reason of making the canon was to prevent that mistaken notion of piety, which had once possessed Origen,[5] who taking those words of our Saviour, "there are some, that make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake," in a wrong sense, fulfilled them literally upon himself. And the Valesian heretics carried the matter a little further, asserting, that men ought to serve God after that manner; and therefore they both made themselves eunuchs, and all that came over to them, as St. Austin[6] informs us. It was to correct and discountenance these erroneous opinions and practices, that the Church at first made this rule; which was so nicely observed, that we scarce meet with two instances to the contrary in after ages. Leontius made himself an eunuch to avoid suspicion in his converse with the virgin Eustolium; but he was deposed from the office of presbyter for the fact, and it gave occasion to the council of Nice to renew the ancient canon against such practices: so that when the Arians afterward ordained him bishop of Antioch, the historians[7] tell us, the Catholics generally declaimed against his ordination as uncanonical. The only instance, that looks like a dispensation with this rule, is what we have in Baronius concerning

---

[1] Con. Nic. c. 1. [2] Canon. Apost. c. 21. [3] Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm. c. 73. [4] Con. Arelat. 2. c. 7. Si qui se, carnali vitio repugnare nescientes, abscindunt, ad Clerum pervenire non possunt.
[5] Vid, Euseb. lib. vi. c. 8. Epiphan. Hær. 64. n. 3. [6] Aug. de Hær. c. 37. Valesii et seipsos castrant, et hospites suos, hoc modo existimantes Deo se debere servire. [7] Socrat. lib. ii. c. 26. Theodor. lib. ii. c. 24.

Timotheus, bishop of Alexandria, ordaining Ammon, the Egyptian monk, who to avoid being ordained had cut off his own right ear to make himself irregular; notwithstanding which, Baronius[1] says, Timotheus ordained him, and justified what he did with this expression: "that this law indeed was observed by the Jews; but, for his own part, if they brought to him a man without a nose, that was but of good morals, he would ordain him bishop." But there is some reason to question the truth of this narration; for not only Palladius, whom Baronius cites, but Socrates[2] and Sozomen, in telling the story, seem rather to intimate, that he was not ordained. However, supposing it to be true, it is a singular instance, and we shall hardly find such another in all the history of the Church; which shows, how cautious the ancients were in observing this rule, that they might not bring any disrepute or scandal upon the Church.

Sect. 10.—Men only accountable for Crimes committed after Baptism, as to what concerned Ordination.

But in all these and the like cases there is one thing particularly to be observed, that the crimes, which made men irregular, were generally understood to be such only as were committed after baptism. For all crimes, committed before baptism, were supposed to be so purged away in the waters of baptism, as that a perfect amnesty passed upon them, and men, notwithstanding them, were capable of ordination. So that not only the crimes, which men committed whilst they were heathens, but such, as they fell into when they were catechumens, were overlooked in this inquiry, when their morals came to be examined for ordination. This is evident not only from the known case of St. Austin, whose faults were never objected to him at his ordination, because they were only such as preceded his baptism; but also from the rule made in the council of Ancyra, in the case of such as lapsed into idolatry whilst they were only catechumens. For the canon[3] says, "That such, as sacrificed before baptism, and were afterward baptised,

[1] Baron. an. 385. p. 513. [2] Socrat. lib. iv. c. 23. Sozom. lib. vii. c. 30. Pallad. Hist. Lausiac. c. 12. [3] Con. Ancyr. c. 12.

might be promoted to ecclesiastical dignities, as persons that were cleansed from all crimes by the sanctification of baptism." It is true, that only one crime of sacrificing is here specified; but by parity of reason the rule must be understood to extend to all other cases of the like nature; and so the practice of the Church has commonly determined.

SECT. II.—Except any great Irregularity happened in their Baptism itself. As in the Case of Clinic Baptism.

Yet here again we must observe, that, if any great irregularity happened in men's baptism itself, such crimes were always objected against them, to debar them from ordination. Thus it was frequently with those, who were baptized only with clinic baptism in time of sickness or urgent necessity, when they had carelessly deferred their baptism to such a critical moment, and might have had it sooner, had it not been their own default. This delaying of baptism was always esteemed a very great crime, and worthy of some ecclesiastical censure; and therefore the Church, among other methods which she took to discountenance the practice of it, thought fit to punish persons, who had been guilty of it, and had put themselves upon the fatal necessity of a clinic baptism, by denying them ordination. We have a canon, in the council of Neo-Cæsarea,[1] to this purpose; 'If any man is baptized only in time of sickness, he shall not be ordained a presbyter, because his faith was not voluntary, but as it were of constraint; except his subsequent faith and diligence recommend him, or else the scarcity of men make it necessary to ordain him." And that this was an old rule of the Church appears from the account, which Cornelius[2] gives of the ordination of Novatian to be presbyter. He says, "the clergy and many of the people objected against it, alleging, that it was not lawful to ordain one, who had been baptized upon his bed in time of sickness; and that the bishop was forced to intercede with them, to give way to his ordination, as a matter of grace and favour;" which shows, that the ordination

[1] Con. Neo-Cæs. c. 12. [2] Ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43.

of such was contrary to the common rule and practice of the Church.

SECT. 12.—And Heretical Baptism.

In like manner they, who were baptized by heretics, were not ordinarily allowed clerical promotion, when they returned to the bosom of the Catholic Church. The council of Eliberis[1] is very peremptory in its decree; "that, whatever heresy they came from, they should not be ordained; or that, if any such were already ordained, they should be undoubtedly degraded." Pope Innocent[2] testifies for the same practice in the Roman Church, saying, "It is the custom of our Church, to grant only lay-communion to those, that return from heretics, by whom they were baptized, and not to admit any of them to the very lowest order of the clergy." But it must be confessed, that the council of Nice dispensed with the Novatians[3] in this respect, allowing their clergy, though both baptized and ordained among them, to be received with imposition of hands, and retain their orders in the Church. And the African fathers granted the same indulgence to the Donatists, to encourage them to return to the unity of the Catholic Church. For in the council of Carthage, Anno 397, which is inserted into the African Code,[4] a proposal was made, "that such, as had been baptized among the Donatists in their infancy by their parents' fault, without their own knowledge and consent, should, upon their return to the Church, be allowed the privilege of ordination;" and in the next council[5] the proposal was accepted, and a decree past accordingly in favour of them. By which we may understand, that this was a piece of discipline, that might be insisted on or waved, according as Church-governors in prudence thought

---

[1] Con. Eliber. c. 51. Ex omni hæresi qui ad nos Fidelis venerit, minimè est ad Clerum promovendus. Vel si qui sunt in præteritum ordinati, sine dubio deponentur. [2] Innoc. Ep. 22. Nostræ lex Ecclesiæ est, venientibus ab Hæreticis, qui tamen illic baptizati sunt, per manûs impositionem Laicam tantùm tribuere Communionem, nec ex his aliquem in Clericatûs honorem vel exiguum subrogare. [3] Con. Nic. c. 8. Χειροθετουμένους αὐτοὺς μένειν οὕτως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ. [4] Cod. Can. Afric. c. 48. al. 47. [5] Ibid. c. 58. al. 57.

most for the benefit and advantage of the Church. But in case the persons so returning had been baptized by such heretics, whose baptism was null, and to be reiterated in the Church;—as the baptism of the Paulianists, or Samosatenian heretics, was;—in that case it was determined by the great council of Nice, that such persons, when they were re-baptized, might be ordained.[1] For baptism, as has been noted before, set men clear of all crimes; and their former baptism being null, that was reckoned their only baptism which they received at their return to the Catholic Church; and no crimes, committed before that, were then to prejudice their ordination in the Church.

SECT. 13.—No Man to be Ordained, who had not made all his Family Catholic Christians.

I cannot here omit to mention another qualification required of persons to be ordained, because it was of great use and service in the Church; which was, that none should be admitted, at least to the superior degrees of bishops, presbyters, or deacons, before they had made all the members of their family Catholic Christians. This is a rule we find in the third council of Carthage,[2] which was equally designed to promote the conversion of pagans, Jews, heretics, and schismatics, who are all opposed to Catholic Christians. And it was a very proper rule in that case; since nothing could be more disadvantageous or dishonourable to religion, than to have any countenance or secret encouragement given to its opposers, by those who were designed to serve at the altar. Besides that, this was but a proper way of making reprisals upon the heathen religion. For Julian had made a like decree for his pagan-priests, in opposition to the Christians;[3] charging Arsacius, high-priest of Galatia,—"that he should admit none to the priest's office, who tolerated either servants, or children, or wives, that were Galilæans; and did not come with their

[1] Con. Nic. c. 19. Ἀναβαπτισθέντες χειροτονείσθωσαν. [2] Con. Carth. iii. c. 18. Ut Episcopi, Presbyteri, et Diaconi non ordinentur, priusquàm omnes, qui sunt in domo eorum, Christianos Catholicos fecerint. [3] Julian. Ep. ad Arsac. ap. Sozomen. lib. v. c. 16.

whole family and retinue to the worship of the gods in the idol-temples." It had been a great omission and oversight in the governors of the Christian Church, had they not been as careful to secure the interest of the true religion in the families of their ministers, as that pagan prince was to secure a false religion among his idol-priests; and therefore had there been nothing more than emulation in the case, yet that had been a sufficient reason to have laid this injunction upon all the candidates of the Christian priesthood.

SECT. 14.—What Methods were anciently taken to prevent Simoniacal Promotions.

There is but one qualification more I shall mention under this head, which was, that men should come honestly and legally to their preferment, and use no indirect or sinister arts to procure themselves an ordination. Merit, and not bribery, was to be their advocate, and the only thing to be considered in all elections. In the three first ages, whilst the preferments were small, and the persecutions great, there was no great danger of ambitious spirits, nor any great occasion to make laws against simoniacal promotions. For then martyrdom was, as it were, a thing annexed to a bishopric; and the first persons, that were commonly aimed and struck at, were the rulers and governors of the Church. But in after ages, ambition and bribery crept in among other vices, and then severe laws were made, both in Church and State, to check and prevent them. Sulpicius Severus takes notice of this difference betwixt the ages of persecution, and those that followed, when he says,[1] "that in the former, men strove who should run fastest to those glorious combats, and more greedily sought for martyrdom by honourable deaths, than in after-times, by wicked ambitions, they sought for the bishoprics of the Church." This implies, that in the age when Sulpicius lived, in the fifth century, some irregular arts were used,

[1] Sever. Hist. lib. ii. p. 99. Certatim in gloriosa certamina ruebantur, multoque avidius tum martyria gloriosis mortibus quærebantur, quàm nunc Episopatus pravis ambitionibus appetuntur.

particular men, to advance themselves to the preferents of the Church. To correct whose ambition and ill signs, the Church inflicted very severe censures upon all ch as were found guilty of simony, or, as some then[1] led it, Χριστεμπορείαν, *the selling of Christ.* The council Chalcedon decreed,[2] "that if any bishop gave ordination, an ecclesiastical office or preferment of any kind, for oney, he himself should loose his office, and the party so eferred be deposed." And the reader may find several ner constitutions of the same import, in those called e Apostolical Canons;[3] the council of Constantinople nder Gennadius, Anno 459; the second council of leans;[5] Bracara,[6] and many others. The imperial laws o were very properly contrived to prevent this abuse: by one of Justinian's laws[7] it was enacted, "that, nenever a bishop was to be chosen, the electors themselves ould take an oath, and insert it into the election-paper, at they did not choose him for any gift, or promise, or endship, or any other cause, but only because they knew m to be a man of the true Catholic Faith, and an unblamble life, and good learning." And in another of his laws, here this same injunction is repeated, it is further provided, that the party elected shall also at the time of his ordinaon take an oath, upon the Holy Gospels, that he neither ive[8] nor promised, by himself or other, nor hereafter will ve to his ordainer, or to his electors, or any other person, y thing to procure him an ordination." And for any shop to ordain another without observing the rule preribed, is deposition by the same law, both for himself and

---

[1] Vid. Epist. Alexandri Alexandrini, ap. Theodor. lib. i. c. 4.
Con. Chalced. c. ii. [3] Canon. Apost. c. 29. [4] Con.
. Epist. Synod. Con. tom. iv. p. 1925. [5] Con. Aurel. ii. c. 3 et 4.
Bracar. ii. c. 3. [7] Justin. Novel. cxxiii. c. 1. Propositis sacrosanctis Evangeliis, periculo suarum animarum dicentes in ipsis decre-, quia neque propter aliquam donationem, nec Promissionem, aut Amicitiam, t aliam quamlibet causam, sed scientes eos rectæ et Catholicæ Fidei, et nestæ esse Vitæ, et literas nosse, hos elegerunt. [8] Novel. xxvii. c. 2. Jusjurandum autem suscipere eum qui ordinatur, per Divinas ripturas, quod neque per se ipsum neque per aliam Personam dedit quid, t promisit, neque posthac dabit, vel ordinanti ipsum, vel his qui sacra pro eo ffragia fecerunt, vel alii cuiquam ordinationis de ipso faciendæ nomine, &c.

the other whom he ordained. These were some of those ancient rules to be observed in the examination of men's lives and morals, before they were consecrated to the sacred function, or admitted to serve in any of the chief offices of the Church.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Qualifications of Persons to be Ordained, respecting their outward State and Condition in the World.

SECT. 1.—No Soldier to be Ordained.

A THIRD inquiry was made into men's outward state and condition in the world. For there were some callings and states of life, which debarred men from the privilege of ordination, not because they were esteemed absolutely sinful vocations, but because the duties attending them were commonly incompatible and inconsistent with the offices of the clergy. Of this nature were all those callings, which come under the general name of *Militia Romana*, which we cannot so properly English, *the military life*, as *the service of the empire*. For it includes several offices, as well civil, as military; the Romans, as Gothofred[1] and other learned persons have observed, calling all inferior offices by the name of *Militia*. So there were three sorts of it, *Militia Palatina*, *Militia Castrensis* or *Armata*, and *Militia Præsidialis* or *Cohortalis*; the first including the officers of the emperor's palace; the second, the armed soldiery of the camp; and the third, the apparitors and officials of judges and governors of provinces; all which were so tied to their service, that they could not forsake their station. And for that reason, the laws of the state forbad any of them to be entertained as ecclesiastics, or ordained among the clergy. Honorius,[2] the emperor, particularly

[1] Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Th. lib. xii. tit. 1. de Decurion. Leg. 63. Vales. Not. in Sozomen. lib. v. c. 4 Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 375. n. 11.

[2] Cod. Th. lib. vii. tit. 20. de Veteranis Leg. 12. Quoniam plurimos vel ante militiam, vel post inchoatam, nec peractam, latere objectu piæ religionis agnovimus, dum se quidam vocabulo Clericorum - - - defendunt, nulli omnino tali excusari objectione permittimus, &c.

made a law to this purpose, "that none, who were originally tied to the military life, as some were even by birth, should, either before or after they were entered upon that life, take upon them any clerical office, or think to excuse themselves from their service, under the notion of becoming ecclesiastical persons." The canons of the Church seem to have carried the matter a little further; for they forbad the ordination of any, who had been soldiers after baptism, because they might perhaps have embrewed their hands in blood. This appears from the letters of Innocent the First, who blames the Spanish Churches[1] for admitting such persons into orders, alleging the canons of the Church against it. The first council of Toledo forbids any such to be ordained deacons, though they had never been concerned in shedding of blood;" because,[2] though they had not actually shed blood, yet by entering upon the military life they had obliged themselves, if occasion had so required, to have done it." Which seems to import, that soldiers might be allowed in the inferior services, but were not to be admitted to the sacred and superior orders of the Church.

SECT. 2.—Nor any Slave or Freedman without the Consent of the Patron.

Another state of life, which debarred men from the privilege of ordination, was that of slaves or vassals in the Roman Empire; who, being originally tied by birth or purchase to their patron's or master's service, could not legally be ordained, because the service of the Church was incompatible with their other duties; and no man was to be defrauded of his right under pretence of an ordination. In this case, therefore, the patron was always to be consulted before the servant was ordained. Thus in one of those called the Apostolical Canons[3] we find a decree, "that no servants should be admitted among the clergy without the

[1] Innoc. Ep. xxiv. c. 2. Quantos ex militia, qui cum protestatibus obedierunt, severa necessario præcepta sunt executi. Ibid. c. 4. Ne quispiam, qui post Baptismum militaverit, ad ordinem debeat Clericatûs admitti. Vid. Ep. 2. ad Victricium rothomagens. c. 2. [2] Con. Tolet. i. c. 8. Si quis post Baptismum militavit, et Chlamydem sumpserit, aut Cingulum ad necandos Fideles, etiamsi gravia non admiserit, si ad Clerum admissus fuerit, Diaconii non accipiat dignitatem. [3] Canon. Apost. c. 82.

consent of their masters, to the grievance of the owners and subversion of their families. But if a servant be found worthy of an ecclesiastical promotion, as Onesimus was, and his master give his consent, and grant him his freedom, and let him go forth from his house, he may be ordained." The council of Toledo[1] has a canon to the same purpose; and the council of Eliberis[2] goes a little further, and says, "Though a secular master, (that is, an heathen, as Albaspinæus interprets it,) had made his servant a freeman, he should not be ordained." The reason of which is conceived to be, that such masters gave them only a conditional freedom, and still retained a right to exact certain services and manual labours of them, which would not consist with the service of the Church. The imperial laws[3] also made provision in this case, that no persons under such obligations should be admitted to any office of the clergy; or, if they were admitted merely to evade their obligations, their masters should have power to recal them to their service, unless they were bishops or presbyters, or had continued thirty years in some other office of the Church. By which it appears, that the ordination of such persons was prohibited only upon a civil account; not because that state of life was sinful, or that it was any undervaluing or disgrace to the function to have such persons ordained, but because the duties of the civil and ecclesiastical state would not well consist together.

SECT. 3.—Nor any Member of a Civil Company or Society of Tradesmen, who were tied to the Service of the Common-wealth.

For the same reason the laws forbad the ordination of any persons, who were incorporated into any society for the ser-

[1] Con. Tolet. i. c. 10. Clericos, si quidem obligati sint vel pro Æquatione, vel de genere alicujus domûs, non ordinandos, nisi probatæ vitæ fuerint, et patroni consensus accesserit. [2] Con. Eliber. c. 80. Prohibendum est, ut liberti, quorum patroni in seculo fuerint, ad Clerum provehantur.
[3] Valent. iii. Novel. 12. ad Calcem Cod. Th. Nullus originarius, inquilinus, servus, vel colonus ad clericale munus accedat - - - ut vinculum debitæ conditionis evadat. - - - Originarii sanè vel servi, qui jugum natalium declinantes, ad ecclesiasticum se ordinem transtulerunt, exceptis Episcopis et Presbyteris, ad dominorum jura recedant, si non in eodem officio annum tricesimum compleverunt.

vice of the common-wealth, unless they had first obtained the leave of the society and prince, under whom they served. This is the meaning of that law[1] of Justinian, which forbids any of those called Ταξιῶται, or *Cohortales*, that is, *the officers* or *apparitors* of judges, to be ordained, unless they had first spent fifteen years in a monastic life. And the first council of Orleans[2] requires expressly, either the command of the prince, or the consent of the judge, before any such secular officer be ordained. By the laws of Theodosius Junior,[3] and Valentinian the Third,[4] all corporation-men are forbidden to be ordained; and if any such were ordained among the inferior clergy, they were to be reclaimed by their respective companies; if among the superior, bishops, presbyters, or deacons, they must provide a proper substitute, qualified with their estate, to serve in the company from whence they were taken. The reader, that is curious in this matter, may find several other laws in the Theodosian Code,[5] made by the elder Valentinian, and Theodosius the Great, with respect to particular civil societies so incorporated for the use of the public; no member of which might be ordained, but either they must quit their estates, or be liable to be recalled to the service, which they had unwarrantably forsaken.

SECT. 4.—Nor any of the *Curiales*, or *Decuriones* of the Roman Government.

For reasons of the same nature, the canons were precise in forbidding the ordination of any of those, who are commonly known by the name of *Curiales*, or *Decuriones*, in the Roman government; that is, such as were members of the *Curia, the court*, or *common-council* of every city. These were men, who by virtue of their estates were tied to

[1] Justin. Novel. 123. c. xv. Sed neque cohortales, neque decuriones Clerici fiunto - - - Dempto si monarchicam aliquis ex ipsis vitam non minus quindecim annis transegerit. [2] Con. Aurel. I. c. 4. Nullus secularium ad Clericatûs officium præsumatur, nisi aut cum Regis jussione, aut cum judicis voluntate. [3] Theodos. Novel. 26. de Corporatis Urbis Romæ, ad Calcem Cod. Th. [4] Valentin. Novel. 12. ibid. [5] Cod. Th. lib. xiv. tit. 4. de Suariis. leg. 8. Eos, qui ad Clericatûs se privilegia contulerunt, aut agnoscere oportet propriam functionem, aut ei corpori, quod declinant, proprii patrimonii facere cessionem. Vid. ibid. l. 14. tit. 3. de Pistoribus leg. 11. It. lib. viii. tit. 5. de Cursu Publico. leg. 46.

bear the offices of their country; so that out of their body were chosen all civil officers, the magistrates of every city, the collectors of the public revenue, the overseers of all public works, the pontifices or flamens who exhibited the public games and shows to the people, with abundance of others, whose offices are specified by Gothofred[1] to the number of twenty-two, which I need not here recite. These were always men of estates, whose substance amounted to the value of three hundred solids; which is the sum that is specified by Theodosius Junior,[2] as qualifying a man to be a member of the *Curia:* and both they and their estates were so tied to civil offices, that no member of that body was to be admitted into any ecclesiastical office, till he had first discharged all the offices of his country, or else provided a proper substitute, one of his relations qualified with his estate, to bear offices in his room. Otherwise the person so ordained was liable by the laws of the empire, (of which I give a more particular account hereafter[3] in the next book,) to be called back by the *Curia* from an ecclesiastical to a secular life again. Which was such an inconvenience to the Church, that she herself made laws to prohibit the ordination of any of these *Curiales*, to avoid the trouble and molestation, which was commonly the consequent of their ordination. St. Ambrose[4] assures us, "that sometimes presbyters and deacons, who were thus ordained out of the *Curiales*, were fetched back to serve in curial offices, after they had been thirty years and more in the service of the Church." And therefore to prevent this calamity, the council of Illyricum, mentioned by Theodoret,[5] made a decree, "that presbyters and deacons should always be chosen out of the inferior clergy, and not out of these *Curiales*, or any other officers of the civil government." Innocent, bishop of Rome, frequently refers to this rule of

---

[1] Gothofred. Paratitlon. Cod. Th. lib. xii. tit. 1. de Decurionibus, tom. iv. p. 339. [2] Theodos. Novel. 38. ad. Calcem Cod. Th. [3] See Book v. chap. lii. sect. 15. [4] Ambr. Ep. 29. Per triginta et innumeros annos Presbyteri quidam gradu functi, vel Ministri Ecclesiæ retrahuntur à munere sacro, et Curiæ deputantur. [5] Ap. Theodor. lib. iv. c. 9. Ἐκ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τάγματος, ἢ μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς βουλευτηρίου ἢ στρατιωτικῆς ἀρχῆς.

the Church[1] in his Epistles, where he gives two reasons against their ordination. First, "that they were often recalled by the *Curia* to serve in civil offices, which brought some tribulation upon the Church." Secondly, "because many of them had served in the office of flamens[2] after baptism; and were crowned, as the heathen high-priests were used to be, while they exhibited the public games and shows to the people." Which, though it was indulged by the civil law in Christian magistrates, yet the Church reckoned a crime, for which men were sometimes obliged to do public penance, as appears from the canons[3] of the council of Eliberis; and consequently such a crime, as made men irregular and incapable of ordination. So that upon both accounts these *Curiales* were to be excluded from the orders of the Church. And though this rule by the importunity of men was sometimes transgressed, yet the laws, both of Church and State, always stood in force against such ordinations; and sometimes the ordainers themselves were punished with ecclesiastical censures. Of which there is a famous instance related by Sozomen,[4] who says, the council of Constantinople, Anno 360, deposed Neonas from his bishopric for ordaining some of these *Curiales* bishops. Sozomen indeed calls them "Πολιτευόμενοι," but that is but another name for *Curiales*, whom the Greeks otherwise term "Βουλευταὶ, *counsellors*;" and the Latins, "*Municipes, burghers*, or *corporation-men*; and *Minor Senatus*,[5] *the little senate of every city*," in opposition to the great senate of Constantinople and Rome. These persons, whatever denomination they went by, were so entirely devoted to the service of the Common-wealth, that, till they

---

[1] Innoc. Ep. iv. c. 3. De Curialibus manifesta ratio est, quoniam etsi inveniantur hujusmodi viri qui debeant Clerici fieri, tamen quoniam sæpius ad Curiam repetuntur, cavendum ab his est propter tribulationem, quæ sæpe de his Ecclesiæ provenit. [2] Innoc. Ep. xxiv. c. 4. Neque de Curialibus aliquem ad ecclesiasticum ordinem venire posse, qui post baptismum vel coronati fuerint, vel sacerdotium, quod dicitur, sustinuerint, et editiones publicas celebraverint, &c. [3] Con. Eliber. c. 3. [4] Sozom. lib. iv. c. 24. [5] Majorian. Novel. 1. ad Calcem Cod. Theod. Curiales servos esse reipublicæ ac viscera civitatum nullus ignorat, quorum cœtum rectè appellavit antiquitas Minorem Senatum.

had some way or other discharged that duty, they might not, as appears, be admitted to serve in any office of the Church.

SECT. 5.—Nor any Proctor or Guardian, till his Office expired.

Indeed it was a general rule in this matter, as we learn from one of the councils of Carthage,[1] "that no one was to be ordained, who was bound to any secular service." And for that reason it was decreed by the same council, at least for the Churches of Afric, "that no agent or factor in other men's business, nor any guardian of orphans, should be ordained, till his office and administration was perfectly expired; because the ordination of such[2] would otherwise turn to the reproach and defamation of the Church." But, if I mistake not, this prohibition did not extend to the inferior orders, but only to those, whose office was to serve at the altar.

SECT. 6.—Pleaders at Law denied Ordination in the Roman Church.

In some Churches there seems also to have been an absolute prohibition and rule against ordaining advocates or pleaders at law, not only whilst they continued in their profession, but for ever after. This seems to have been the custom of the Roman and Spanish Churches. For Innocent, bishop of Rome, in a letter[3] to the council of Toledo, complains of an abuse then crept into the Spanish Church, which was, that many, who were exercised in pleading at the bar, were called to the priesthood. To correct which abuse, as he deemed it, he proposed this rule to them to be observed, "that no one, who had pleaded causes after baptism,[4] should be admitted to any order of the clergy." What particular reasons the Church of Rome might then

[1] Con. Carth. i. c. 9. Obnoxii alienis negotiis non ordinentur. [2] Ibid. c. 8. Procuratores, et actores, etiam tutores pupillorum - - - - si ante libertatem negotiorum vel officiorum, ab aliquo sine consideratione fuerint ordinati, Ecclesia infamatur. [3] Innoc. Ep. 24. ad Concil. Tolet. c. 2. quantos ex eis, qui post acceptam baptismi gratiam, in forensi exercitatione versati sunt, et obtinendi pertinaciam susceperunt, accitos ad Sacerdotium esse comperimus? [4] Ibid. c. 4. Ne quispiam ad ordinem debeat Clericatûs admitti, qui causas post acceptum baptismum egerit.

e for this prohibition I cannot say; but it does not ap-
r, that this was the general rule of the whole Catholic
urch. For the council of Sardica[1] allows a lawyer even
e ordained bishop, if he first went regularly through the
ces of reader, deacon, and presbyter; which shows,
t the custom, as to this particular, was not one and the
ne in all Churches.

SECT. 7.—Also Energumens, Actors, Stage-players, &c. in all Churches.

The reader may find several other cautions, given by
nnadius,[2] against ordaining any, who had been actors or
ge-players; or energumens, during the time of their be-
possessed; or such as had married concubines, that is,
es without formality of law; or that had married harlots,
wives divorced from a former husband. But I need not
st upon these, since the very naming them shows all
h persons to have been in such a state of life, as might
sonably be accounted a just impediment of ordination.
rill be more material to inquire, what the ancients meant
digamy, which, after the Apostle, they always reckoned
objection against a man's ordination?—And whether any
v of perpetual celibacy was exacted of the ancient
gy, when they were admitted to the orders of the
urch?—Which, because they are questions that come
perly under this head, it will not be amiss to resolve
inctly, but briefly, in the following chapter.

CHAP. V.

*the State of Digamy and Celibacy in particular; and of
he Laws of the Church about these, in reference to the
Ancient Clergy.*

SECT. 1.—No Digamist to be Ordained, by the Rule of the Apostle.

As to what concerns digamy, it was a primitive aposto-

Con. Sardic. c. 10. Ἐάν τις σχολαστικὸς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἀξιοῖτο ἐπίσκοπος σθαι, μὴ πρότερον καθίσασθαι, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ ἀναγνώστου, καὶ διακόνου, καὶ πρεσ-ρου ὑπηρεσίαν ἐκτελέσῃ. [2] Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm. c. 73.

lical rule, "that a bishop or a deacon should be one, who was the husband of one wife only," on which rule all the laws against digamy in the primitive Church were founded. But then we are to observe, that the ancients were not exactly agreed about the sense of that apostolical rule; and that occasioned different notions and different practices among them in reference to the ordination of digamists.

SECT. 2.—Three different Opinions among the Ancients about Digamy. I. That all Persons were to be refused Orders, as Digamists, who were twice Married after Baptism.

One very common and prevailing notion was, that all persons were to be refused orders, as digamists, who were twice married after baptism, though legally and successively to two wives, one after another. For though they did not condemn second marriages, as sinful and unlawful, with the Novatians and Montanists; yet upon presumption that the Apostle had forbidden persons twice married to be ordained bishops, they repelled such from the superior orders of the Church. That this was the practice of some Churches in the time of Origen, may appear from what he says in his Comments upon St. Luke, "that not only fornication,[1] but marriages excluded men from the dignities of the Church; for no digamist could be either bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, or deaconess in the Church." Tertullian, when he became a Montanist, laid hold of this argument, and urged it to decry second marriages in all persons; pleading,[2] "that a layman could not in decency desire licence of the ecclesiastics to be married a second time, seeing the ecclesiastics themselves, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, were but once married;" which he repeats frequently[3] in several parts of his writings. And it cannot be denied, but that many other ancient writers, St.

[1] Orig. Hom. 17. in Luc. p. 228. Ab ecclesiasticis dignitatibus non solum fornicatio, sed et nuptiæ repellunt: neque enim Episcopus, nec Presbyter, nec Diaconus, nec Vidua, possunt esse digami. [2] Tertul. de Monogam. c. 11. Qualis es id matrimonium postulans, quod eis, à quibus postulas, non licet habere?—Ab Episcopo monogamo, à Presbyteris et Diaconis ejusdem sacramenti, &c. [3] Vid. Tertul. de Pœnitent. c. 9. De Exhort. Castitat. c. 7. Ad Uxor. lib. i. c. 7.

ıbrose,[1] St. Jerom,[2] Gennadius,[3] Epiphanius,[4] and the ıncils of Agde,[5] and Carthage,[6] put the same sense upon ı words of the Apostle. Only Epiphanius puts a distinc- n between the superior and inferior orders, making the e in this sense obligatory to the former, but not to the ter.

ET. 3.—2. Others extended the Rule to all Persons twice Married, whether before or after Baptism.

Some there are again, who gave the rule a stricter expo- ion, making it a prohibition not only of ordaining persons ice married after baptism, but also such as were twice mar- d before it, or once before and once after; as many Gen- es and catechumens happened to be in those times, when ptism was administered to adult persons. St. Ambrose[7] ıs of opinion, that even these were to be excluded from dination; and so it was decreed by Innocent, bishop of ɔme,[8] and the council of Valencia[9] in France. But this ıinion was generally rejected by others, as furthest from e sense of the Apostle.

CT. 4.—3. The most probable Opinion of those, who thought the Apostle by Digamists meant Polygamists, and such as married after Divorce.

The most probable opinion is that of those ancient wri- rs, who interpret the Apostle's rule as a prohibition of daining polygamists, or such as had married many wives the same time; and such as had causelessly put away ıeir wives, and married others after divorcing the former; hich were then very common practices both among Jews ıd Gentiles, but scandalous in themselves, and such as ıe Apostles would have to be accounted just impediments f ordination. This is the sense, which Chrysostom[10] and heodoret[11] propose and defend, as most agreeable to the

---

[1] Ambros. de Offic. lib. i. c. 50. [2] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. p. 11. ad Geront. Ep. 83. ad. Ocean. [3] Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm. 73. [4] Epiphan. Expos. Fid. n. 21. [5] Con. Agathen. c. 1. Con. Carth. iv. c. 69. [7] Ambros. Ep. 82. ad Vercellenses. Innoc. Ep. ii. c. 6. Ep. xxii. c. 2. Ep. xxiv. c. 6. [9] Con. Valentin. 1. [10] Chrysost. Hom. x. in 1 Tim. iii. 2. Hom. ii. in tit. 1. 6. Theod. Com. in 1 Tim. iii. 2.

mind of the Apostle. And it is certain, that second marriages in any other sense were not always an insuperable objection against men's ordination in the Christian Church. For Tertullian[1] owns, that there were bishops among the Catholics, who had been twice married; though, in his style, that was an affront to the Apostle. And it appears from the Letters of Siricius,[2] and Innocent,[3] that the bishops of Spain and Greece made no scruple to ordain such generally among the clergy; for they take upon them to reprove them for it. Theodoret, agreeably to his own notion, ordained one Irenæus bishop, who was twice married; and, when some objected against the legality of the ordination upon that account, he defended it by the common practice of other Churches. "Herein," says he,[4] "I followed the example of my predecessors." Alexander, bishop of the apostolical see of Antioch, with Acacius, of Bercœa, ordained Diogenes, a digamist; and Praylius ordained Domninus of Cæsarea, a digamist likewise. Proclus, bishop of Constantinople, received and approved the ordination of many such; and so do the bishops of Pontus and Palæstine, among whom no controversy is made about it. From hence it appears, that the practice of the Church varied in this matter; and that therefore Bellarmin and other Romanists very much abuse their readers, when they pretend that the ordination of digamists, meaning persons twice lawfully married, is both against the rule of the Apostle, and the universal consent and practice of the Church.

SECT. 5.—No Vow of Celibacy required of the Clergy, as a Condition of their Ordination, for the Three first Ages.

They still more abuse their readers, in pretending, that a vow of perpetual celibacy, or abstinence from conjugal society, was required of the clergy, as a condition of their ordination, even from the apostolical ages. For the contrary is very evident from innumerable examples of bishops

---

[1] Tertul. de Monogam. c. 12. Quot enim et digami præsident apud vos, insultantes utique Apostolo? [2] Siric. Ep. 1. ad Himer. Tarracon. c. 8. [3] Innoc. Ep. 22. ad Episc. Maced. c. 1. [4] Theod. Ep. 110. ad Domnum.

nd presbyters, who lived in a state of matrimony without ny prejudice to their ordination or function. It is generally greed by ancient writers, that most of the Apostles were iarried. Some say, all of them except[1] St. Paul and St. ohn. Others say, St. Paul was married also, because he rites "to his yoke-fellow," whom they interpret his wife. 'hil. iv. 3. This was the opinion of Clemens Alexandrinus,[2] 'herein he seems to be followed by Eusebius,[3] and Origen,[4] nd the author of the Interpolated Epistle[5] to the Church f Philadelphia under the name of Ignatius; whom some iodern Romanists, mistaking him for the true Ignatius, have iost disingenuously mangled, by erasing the name of Paul ut of the text; which foul dealing bishop Usher[6] has exosed, and Cotelerius[7] does in effect confess it, when he wns that the author himself wrote it, and that he therein ›llowed the authority of Clemens, Origen, and Eusebius. But assing by this about St. Paul, which is a matter of disute among learned men, the major part inclining to think, iat he always lived a single life, it cannot be denied, that thers of the Apostles were married. And in the next ages fter them we have accounts of married bishops, presbyters, nd deacons, without any reproof or mark of dishonour set pon them. As to instance in a few, Valens, presbyter f Philippi, mentioned by Polycarp;[8] Chæremon, bishop of lilus, an exceeding old man, who fled with his wife to iount Arabion in time of persecution, where they both peshed together, as Eusebius informs us.[9] Novatus was a iarried presbyter of Carthage, as we learn from Cyprian's pistles.[10] Cyprian himself was also a married man, as Mr.

---

[1] Ambros. ad Hilar. in 2 Cor. xi. Omnes Apostoli, exceptis Johanne et aulo, uxores habuerunt. Vid. Epiphan. Hær. 78. Antidicomarianit. n. 10. otelerius cites Eusebius, Basil, and some others for the same opinion. Not. Ignat. Ep. ad Philadelph. Interpolat. n. 4. [2] Clem. Alex. Strom. . p. 448. [3] Euseb. lib. iii. c. 30. [4] Orig. Com. in Rom. i. . 459. Paulus ergo (sicut quidam tradunt) cum uxore vocatus est: de quâ cit, ad Philippenses scribens: "Rogo te etiam germana compar, &c." Pseudo-Ignat. Ep. ad Philadelph. n. 4. [6] Usser. Dissert. in Igat. c. 17. [7] Coteler. Not. in Loc. [8] Polycarp. Ep. ad hilip. n. 11. [9] Euseb. lib. vi. c. 42. [10] Cypr. Ep. 49. . 52. ad Cornel.

Pagi[1] confesses; and so was Cæcilius,[2] the presbyter, that converted him. As also Numidicus, another presbyter of Carthage, of whom Cyprian[3] tells us this remarkable story, "That in the Decian persecution he saw his own wife, with many other martyrs, burnt by his side; whilst he himself, lying half burnt, and covered with stones, and left for dead, was found expiring by his own daughter, who drew him out of the rubbish, and brought him to life again." Eusebius assures us, that Phileas,[4] bishop of Thmuis, and Philoromus had, each of them, both a wife and children; for they were urged with that argument, by the heathen magistrate, to deny their religion in the Diocletian persecution; but they generously contemned his argument, and gave preference to the laws of Christ. Epiphanius[5] says, Marcian, the heretic, was the son of a bishop, and that he was excommunicated by his own father for his lewdness. Domnus also, bishop of Antioch,[6] is said to be son to Demetrian, who was bishop of the same place before him. It were easy to add abundance more such instances; but these are sufficient to show, that men of all states were admitted to be bishops and presbyters in the primitive ages of the Church.

SECT. 6.—The Vanity of the contrary Pretences.

The most learned advocates of the Roman Communion have never found any other reply to all this, save only a groundless pretence of their own imagination, that all married persons, when they came to be ordained, promised to live separate from their wives by consent, which answered the vow of celibacy in other persons. This is all, that Pagi[7] or Schelstrate[8] have to say in the case, after all the writers that have gone before them; which is said not only without proof, but against the clearest evidences of ancient history, which manifestly prove the contrary. For Novatus, presbyter of Carthage, whose case Pagi had under consideration,

---

[1] Pagi Crit. in Baron. ad an. 248. n. 4. [2] Pontius Vit. Cyprian. [3] Cypr. Ep. 35. al. 40. Numidicus Presbyter uxorem adhærentem lateri suo, concrematam simul cum cæteris, vel conservatam magis dixerim, lætus aspexit, &c. [4] Euseb. lib. viii. c. 9. [5] Epiphan. Hær. 42. [6] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 30. [7] Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 248. n. 4. [8] Schelstrat. Eccles. Afric. Dissert. 3. c. 4. ap. Pagi ibid.

was certainly allowed to cohabit with his wife after ordination; as appears from the charge that Cyprian brings against him, "that he had struck and abused his wife,[1] and thereby caused her to miscarry; for which crime he had certainly been thrust out, not only from the presbytery, but the Church also, had not the persecution coming on so suddenly prevented his trial and condemnation." Cyprian does not accuse him for cohabiting with his wife, or begetting children after ordination, but for murdering his children which he had begotten; which was indeed a crime that made him liable both to deposition and excommunication; but the other was no crime at all, by any law then in force in the African, or in the Universal Church. There seems indeed in some places to have been a little tendency towards introducing such a law by one or two zealous spirits; but the motion was no sooner made, than it was quashed immediately by the prudence and authority of wiser men. Thus Eusebius observes, "that Pinytus, bishop of Gnossus, in Crete, was for laying the law of celibacy upon his brethren; but Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, wrote to him, that he should consider the weakness of men, and not impose that heavy burthen upon them."[2] And thus matters continued for three centuries, without any law, that we read of, requiring celibacy of the clergy at the time of their ordination.

SECT. 7.—The Clergy left to their Liberty by the Nicene Council.

In the council of Nice, Anno 325, the motion was again renewed, "that a law might pass to oblige the clergy to abstain from all conjugal society with their wives, which they had married before their ordination." But the proposal was no sooner made, than Paphnutius, a famous Ægyptian bishop, and one himself never married, vigorously declaimed against it, saying, "so heavy a burthen was not to be laid upon the Clergy; that the marriage-bed was honourable,

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. 52, al, 49. p. 97. Uterus uxoris calce percussus, et abortione properante in parricidium partus expressus, &c. [2] Dionys. Ep. ad Pinytum ap. Eusch. lib. iv. c. 23. Μὴ βαρὺ φορτίον τὸ περὶ ἁγνείας ἐπαναγκὲς τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐπιτιθέναι.

and that they should not by too great severity bring detriment on the Church; for all men could not bear so severe an exercise, and the chastity of the wives so separated would be endangered also.—"Conjugal society," he said, "was chastity; and it was enough, that such of the clergy, as were not married before their ordination, should continue unmarried, according to the ancient tradition of the Church; but it was not proper to separate any one from his wife, which he had married whilst he was a layman." This said, the whole council agreed to stifle the motion that had been made, and left every man to his liberty as before. So Socrates[1] and Sozomen tell the story; to which all, that Valesius,[2] after Bellarmin, has to say, is, "That he suspects the truth of the thing, and desires leave to dissent from his historians." Which is but a poor evasion, in the judgment of Du Pin himself, who thus reflects upon them for it;[3] "Some question the truth of this story," says he, "but I believe they do it for fear the story might prejudice the present discipline, rather than from any solid proof they have for it. But they should consider, that this canon is purely a matter of discipline, and that the discipline of the Church may change according to the times, and that it is not necessary, for the defence of it, to prove that it was always uniform in all places." So that, in the judgment of that learned Romanist, there is no question to be made, but that the council of Nice decreed in favour of the married clergy, as the historians relate it did; and that then the practice was different from that of the present Church of Rome, which others are so unwilling to have the world believe.

SECT. 8.—And other Councils of that Age.

It is as evident from other councils of the same age, that the married clergy were allowed to continue in the service of the Church, and no vow of abstinence required of them at their ordination. Socrates observes, that the council of Gangra anathematized Eustathius, the heretic, because he

---

[1] Socrat. lib. i. c. 11. Sozom. lib. i. c. 23. [2] Vales. Not. in Socrat. lib. i. c. 11. [3] Du Pin Bibliotheque, vol. ii. p. 253. Edit. Anglic.

taught men to separate[1] from such presbyters, as retained their wives, which they married while they were layman, saying, their communion and oblations were abominable. The decree is still extant among the canons of that council,[2] and runs in these words; "If any one separate from a married presbyter, as if it were unlawful to participate of the eucharist, when such an one ministers, let him be *Anathema*." The council of Ancyra gives leave to deacons to marry after ordination; "if they protested[3] at their ordination that they could not continue in an unmarried state, they might marry, and yet continue in their office, having in that case the bishop's license and permission to do it." And though the council of Neo-Cæsarea in one canon forbids[4] unmarried presbyters to marry after ordination; yet such, as were married before ordination, are allowed by another canon[5] to continue without any censure, being only obliged to separate from their wives in case of fornication. The council of Eliberis,[6] indeed, and some others in this age, began to be a little more rigorous toward the married clergy; but it does not appear, that their laws were of any great force. For Socrates says,[7] even in his time, in the eastern Churches, many eminent bishops begat children of their lawful wives; and such, as abstained, did it not by obligation of any law, but their own voluntary choice. Only in Thessaly, Macedonia, and Hellas, the clergy were obliged to abstain under pain of ecclesiastical censure; which, he says, was occasioned by Bishop Heliodore's writing his book, called his Ethiopics. So that as yet there was no universal decree against married bishops in the Greek Church, much less against presbyters and deacons. But the council of Trullo, Anno 692, made a difference between bishops and presbyters; allowing presbyters, deacons, and all the inferior

---

[1] Socrat. lib. ii. c. 43. Πρεσβυτέρῳ γυναῖκα ἔχοντος, ἣν νόμῳ λαϊκὸς ὢν ἠγάγετο, τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν ὡς μῦσος ἐκκλίνειν ἐκέλευε.

[2] Con. Gangr. c. 4. Ἐι τις διακρίνοιτο παρὰ πρεσβυτέρῳ γεγαμηκότος, ὡς μὴ χρῆναι λειτουργήσαντος αὐτῷ προσφορᾶς μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

[3] Con. Ancyr. c. 10. Ἐι ἐμαρτύραντο καὶ ἔφασαν χρῆναι γαμῆσαι, μὴ δυνάμενοι οὕτως μένειν; ὅτοι μέτα ταῦτα γαμήσαντες ἔεωσαν ἐν τῇ ὑπηρεσίᾳ, &c.

[4] Con. Neo-Cæs. c. 1. [5] Ibid. c. 8. [6] Con. Elib. c. 33. Con. Arelat. ii. c. 2. [7] Socrat. lib. v. c. 22.

orders, to cohabit with their wives after ordination,[1] and giving the Roman Church a smart rebuke for the contrary prohibition; but yet laying an injunction upon bishops[2] to live separate from their wives, and appointing the wives[3] to betake themselves to a monastic life, or become deaconesses in the Church. And so the matter was altered in the Greek Church, as to bishops, but not any others. In the Latin Church, also, the alteration was made but by slow steps in many places; for in Afric, even bishops themselves cohabited with their wives at the time of the council of Trullo, as appears from one of the forementioned canons[4] of that council. But it is beyond my design to carry this inquiry any further; what has been already said, being sufficient to show, that the married clergy were allowed to officiate in the first and primitive ages; and that celibacy in those times was no necessary condition of their ordination, as is falsely pretended by the polemical writers of the present Church of Rome. I have now gone through the several qualifications of the ancient clergy, concerning which, inquiry was made before their ordination; I come now, in the next place, to consider the solemnity of the thing itself, together with the laws and customs, which were generally observed at the time of ordination.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Ordinations of the Primitive Clergy, and the Laws and Customs generally observed therein.

SECT. 1.—The Canons of the Church to be read to the Clerk, before the Bishops ordained him.

WHEN the election of a person, duly qualified according to the forementioned rules, was made, then it was the bishop's office, or the metropolitan's, if the party elect was himself a bishop, to ordain him. But, before they proceeded to ordination, there were some other laws and rules to be

[1] Con. Trull. c. 13. [2] Ibid. c. 12. [3] Ibid. c. 48. [4] Con. Trull. c. 12.

observed. For, not to mention here again the oath against simony, and the subscriptions, which I have showed before[1] were anciently required of persons to be ordained, I must not forget to note, that in the African Church a rule was made in the third council of Carthage,[2] and thence transferred into the African Code;[3] "That, before any bishop or other clergyman was ordained, the ordainers should cause the canons of the Church to be read in his hearing; that they might not have cause to repent afterward, that they had transgressed any of them." This rule was made at the instance and request of St. Austin, as Possidius[4] notes in his life, who says, "that because he was ordained bishop of Hippo, while Valerius was alive, which was contrary to the rule of the council of Nice, which he was ignorant of at the time of his ordination, he therefore prevailed with the African fathers to make a decree, that the canons of the Church should be read at every man's ordination. This rule implied a tacit promise, that the party ordained would observe the canons, that were read to him; but for greater security it was afterward improved into an explicit promise by a law of Justinian,[5] which requires every clerk, after the reading of the canons, to profess, that, as far as it was possible for man to do, he would fulfil what was contained in them. Whence, no doubt, came those later forms of professing obedience to the canons of the seven general-councils, in the Greek Church; and the oath to St. Peter, taken by the bishops of Rome in the Latin Church, that they would observe the decrees of the eight general-councils. The first of which forms may be seen at length in Habertus,[6] and the other in Baronius,[7] and the book called, *Liber Diurnus*, by the reader that is curious to consult them.

[1] See chap. iii. sect. 2 and 14. [2] Con. Carth. iii. c. 3. Placuit, ut ordinandis Episcopis vel Clericis prius ab ordinatoribus suis Decreta Conciliorum auribus eorum inculcentur; ne se aliquid contra statuta Concilii fecisse pœniteat. [3] Cod. Eccles. Afr. c. 19. [4] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 8. Quod in seipso fieri non debuisse, ut vivo suo Episcopo ordinaretur, posteà et dixit et scripsit, propter Concilii Universalis vetitum, quod jam ordinatus didicit: nec quod sibi factum esse doluit, aliis fieri voluit. Unde etiam sategit, ut Conciliis constitueretur Episcoporum, ab ordinatoribus deberi ordinandis, vel ordinatis, omnium statuta Sacerdotum in notitiam esse deferenda.
[5] Justin. Novel. 6. c. 1. n. 8. [6] Habert. Archieratic. p. 496.
[7] Baron. an. 869. tom. x. p. 433.

SECT. 2.—No Clerk to be Ordained ἀπολελυμένως.

Secondly. Another rule to be observed in this case was, "That every man should be fixed to some Church at his ordination, and not be left at liberty to minister wherever he would, because of several inconveniences that attended that practice." This rule concerned bishops, as well as the inferior clergy; for the *Nullatenenses* of later ages, as Panormitan calls titular and utopian bishops, were rarely known in the primitive Church. For though every bishop was in some sense ordained bishop of the Catholic Church, as I have showed before, yet for order's sake he was always confined to a certain district in the ordinary exercise of his power. And so presbyters and all other inferior clergy were confined to the diocese of their own bishop, and might not be ordained, unless they had some place, wherein to exercise their function. This was the ancient custom of the Church, which the council of Chalcedon confirmed by a canon, "That no presbyter, or deacon, or any other ecclesiastic should be ordained at large;[1] but be assigned either to the city-church, or some church or oratory in the country, or a monastery; otherwise his ordination to be null and void. This the Latins called, *Ordinatio Localis*, and the persons so ordained, *Locales*, from their being fixed to a certain place. As in the council of Valentia,[2] in Spain, we find a canon, that obliges every priest, before his ordination, to give a promise, "that he will be *Localis*," to the intent that no one should be permitted to transgress the rules and discipline of the Church with impunity; which they might easily do, if they were allowed to rove about from one place to another. This, in the style of Leo,[3] bishop of Rome, is, "Ordination founded upon a place," or, as we would say now, a title; without which, he says, the ordination was

---

[1] Con. Chalced. c. 6. Μηδένα ἀπολελυμένως χειροτονεῖσθαι - - - εἰ μὴ ἰδικῶς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ πόλεως, ἢ κώμης, ἢ μαρτυρίῳ, ἢ μοναστηρίῳ ἐπικηρύττοιτο.
[2] Con. Valentin. c. 6. Nec ullum Sacerdotem quispiam ordinet, qui localem se futurum primitùs non spoponderit: ut per hoc nullus a regulâ vel disciplinâ ecclesiæ deviare permittatur impunè.
[3] Leo Ep. 92. ad Rustic. c. 1. Vana est habenda ordinatio, quæ nec loco fundata est, nec auctoritate munita.

not to be looked upon as authentic. But it must be observed, that a title then did not always signify a parochial Church, or distinct cure; for this was a rule before dioceses were divided into parishes: but the confinement laid upon men at their ordination was, that they should be fixed to their own bishop's diocese, and officiate in the place, where he appointed them.

SECT. 3.—Exceptions to this Rule very rare.

There were, indeed, some few exceptions to this rule, but very rare, and upon extraordinary occasions. Paulinus and St. Jerom seem to have had the privilege granted them, of being ordained without affixing to any Church. Paulinus says expressly of himself,[1] "that he was ordained presbyter at Barcelona with this condition, that he should not be confined to that Church, but remain a priest at large." And St. Jerom gives the same account of his own ordination at Antioch;[2] "that he was consecrated presbyter, with license to continue a monk, and return to his monastery again." Sozomen[3] relates the like of Barses and Eulogius, two monks of Edessa, "that they were both ordained bishops, not of any city, but only honorary bishops within their own monasteries, out of respect to their eminent virtues." And it was such a sort of ordination, that, Theodoret says,[4] Flavian, bishop of Antioch, gave to Macedonius, the famous Syrian anchoret, whom he drew from his cell in the desart, only to ordain him presbyter, and so let him return to the desart again. These are all the instances of this kind, which I remember in ancient history. It was not as yet the custom to ordain bishops "*Partibus Infidelium*," that never meant to see their bishoprics. Though after ages despised this rule, as Zonaras[5] complains of the Greek Church, and Habertus cannot but lament it in the Latin;[6] yet the ancient Church was more punctual in observing the

[1] Paulin. Ep. vi. ad Sever. p. 101. Eâ conditione in Barcinonensi Ecclesiâ consecrari adductus sum, ut ipsi Ecclesiæ non alligarer; in sacerdotium tantum domini, non in locum Ecclesiæ dedicatus. [2] Hieron. Ep. 62. ad Pammach. Tom. ii. p. 181. [3] Sozom. lib. vi. c. 34. [4] Theod. Histor. Relig. c. xiii. tom. iii. [5] Zonar. Not. in Con. Chalced. c. 6. [6] Habert. Archieratic. p. 351.

laws, scarce ever ordaining either bishop or inferior clerk without fixing them to a certain diocese, from which, without the consent of their superiors, they were not to remove to any other.

SECT. 4.—No Bishop to Ordain another Man's Clerk without his Consent.

And from hence arose a third rule about ordinations, that no bishop should ordain, or admit into his Church any clerk belonging to another Church, without the consent of the bishop, to whom he formerly belonged. The councils[1] are very peremptory in this decree; particularly the great council of Nice,[2] and that of Sardica,[3] and the second of Arles,[4] declare all such ordinations null and void. The first council of Carthage[5] extends the prohibition even to laymen belonging to another diocese; for it decrees, "that as no clerk shall be received by another bishop without the letters dimissory of his own bishop; so neither shall any bishop take a layman out of another people, and ordain him, without the consent of that bishop, out of whose people he is taken." The reason of which laws was, that every bishop was supposed to have a peculiar right in all the clergy and people of his own diocese; and it was very conducive to the peace and good order of the Church to have such rules maintained and observed. Only in the African Church the bishop of Carthage was allowed a privilege in this case, as he was exarch or primate of all the African provinces. For by ancient custom, confirmed by a canon in the third council of Carthage,[6] which is also inserted into the African Code,[7] the bishop of Carthage is allowed "to take a clerk out of another Church, and ordain him for the service of any Church under his jurisdiction." But an exception in his particular case confirms the rule in all the rest.

---

[1] Vid. Con. Carthag. iii. c. 21. Con. Chalced. c. 20. Arausican. i. c. 8, 9.
[2] Con. Nic. c. 16. Ἄκυρος ἔστω ἡ χειροτονία. [3] Con. Sardic. c. 15.
[4] Con. Arelat. ii. c. 13. Si aliquis, invito Episcopo suo, in alienâ Ecclesiâ habitans, ab Episcopo loci Clericus fuerit ordinatus, hujusmodi ordinatio irrita habeatur. [5] Con. Carth. i. c. 5. Non licere Clericum alienum ab aliquo suscipi sine Literis Episcopi sui, neque apud se retinere, nec Laicum usurpare sibi de Plebe alienâ, ut eum ordinet sine conscientiâ ejus Episcopi, de cujus Plebe est. [6] Con. Carth. iii. c. 45. [7] Cod. Can. Afric. c. 55. Περὶ τοῦ ἐξεῖναι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Καρχηδόνος, ὅθεν θέλει, κλήρικον χειροτονεῖν.

SECT. 5.—No Bishop to Ordain in another Man's Diocese.

Another rule for the preservation of order in this affair was, that every bishop should confine himself to his own Church, and not assume to himself the power of ordaining in the diocese of another man. So the council of Antioch,[1] and those called the Apostolical Canons determined,[2] "that a bishop should not presume to ordain out of his own bounds, in cities or countries not subject to him." St. Austin had occasion to insist upon this rule in the case of Pinianus, when the people of Hippo required him to ordain him presbyter against his will, and threatened, that, if he would not, they would have another bishop to ordain him. St. Austin told them,[3] "that no bishop could ordain him in his Church without first asking his leave and permission; and that having given him a promise, that he would not ordain him against his will, he could not in honour consent that any other bishop should come and ordain him." Socrates says,[4] Epiphanius took upon him to ordain a deacon in the diocese of Chrysostom at Constantinople; but Chrysostom told him, "that he acted contrary to canon, in ordaining in Churches, that were not under his jurisdiction." Which shows, that this was an universal law, prevailing both in the eastern and western Churches. And by the same rule all metropolitans, with their provincial bishops, were confined to their own province, and might not ordain any bishop in another province, except they were invited by the bishops of that province to come and give them their assistance. Which rule was made in the general-council of Constantinople,[5] and confirmed in the council of Ephesus,[6] upon the controversy that arose between the Churches of Cyprus and the patriarch of Antioch, who laid claim to the power of ordinations in those Churches,

---

[1] Con. Antioch. c. 22. [2] Canon. Apost. c. 35. Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ τολμᾶν ἔξω τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ὅρων χειροτονίας ποιεῖσθαι εἰς τὰς μὴ ὑποκειμένας αὐτῷ πόλεις ἢ χώρας. [3] Aug. Ep. 225. ad Albinam. Dicebam ego quibus poteram, qui ad nos in absidem honoratiores et graviores ascenderant, nec à promissi fide me posse dimoveri, nec ab alio Episcopo in Ecclesiâ mihi traditâ, nisi me interrogato ac permittente, posse ordinari. [4] Socrat. lib. vi. c. 12 et 14. [5] Con. Constant. c. 2. [6] Con. Ephes. Act. 7. Decret. de Episc. Cypr.

but was rejected in his claim, because they were out of his district, and under another jurisdiction. But it is to be observed, that these rules were only made for ordinary cases, to preserve peace and a good understanding among the bishops of the Church, whilst every one acted in his proper sphere, and kept to those bounds and limits, which the laws appointed. For otherwise, as I have showed heretofore,[1] every bishop was a bishop of the whole Catholic Church, and in that capacity authorized to ordain, or perform any other acts of the episcopal office in any part of the world, upon urgent necessity and extraordinary occasions. As Athanasius and Eusebius Samosatensis did in the times of the great prevalency of the Arian heresy; ordaining bishops and presbyters in any province or diocese (though contrary to the letter of this law) in order to preserve the Catholic Faith, and a succession of orthodox men in the service of the Church. So that this was only a rule for common and ordinary cases. And in Cyprus, Epiphanius says,[2] "they did not insist upon the rule at all one among another, but any bishop ordained in any other man's diocese, as occasion required, without breach of charity; for they gave a sort of general leave to one another, as finding it most expedient for the Church in that province to use such a liberty among themselves; though they stiffly maintained their privilege against the encroachments of all foreign sees, and more especially that of Antioch."

SECT. 6.—The Original of the Four Solemn Times of Ordination.

The next things, to be noted in this affair, are such as concern the time and place of ordination. Concerning the time there may several inquiries be made. 1. Whether they had originally any set and constant times of ordination, as the Church now has four times a year?—2. Whether Sunday was always the day of ordination?—3. Whether ordinations were always confined to morning-service? As to the first inquiry, it does not certainly appear, that the

---

[1] Book ii. chap. v. [2] Epiphan. Ep. ad Johan. Hierosolym. tom. ii. p. 318. Multi Episcopi communionis nostræ Presbyteros in nostrâ ordinaverunt provinciâ, &c.

Church had any constant annual times of ordination before the fourth century. For Habertus truly observes,[1] "that then it was more usual to ordain men singly, as the present occasions of every Church required." Pope Leo[2] indeed derives the *Jejunia quatuor temporum, the fasts of the four seasons of the year*, which are now commonly called *Ember Weeks*, from apostolical tradition. But as Mr. Pagi[3] and Quesnel[4] in their censures of that author observe, there is nothing more usual with him, than to call every thing an apostolical law, which he found either in the practice of his own Church, or decreed in the archives of his predecessors, Damasus and Siricius. So that all other authors before Leo being silent upon this matter, we can lay no great stress upon his authority for it. Beside, he does not so much as once intimate, that these fasts were appointed upon the account of any set and solemn times of ordinations, but upon other more general reasons. So that it is not certain, that the Church had any fixed times of ordination, when Leo wrote, Anno 450; and in the ages before, it is more evident she had not. For as to bishops, it is certain the Church never confined herself to any set times for the ordination of them; but as soon as any bishop was dead, another was chosen and ordained in his room with all convenient speed; and in some places this was done within a day or two after his decease, as has been showed in a former book.[5] As to presbyters, and deacons, and others below them, it is evident also, that for the three first ages they were ordained at all times, as the occasions of the Church required. Cyprian ordained Aurelius a reader upon the first of December, as bishop Pearson[6] computes by the critical rules of calculation: and he ordained Saturus, a reader, and Optatus, a subdeacon, in the month of August;[7] neither of which were solemn times of ordination.

---

[1] Habert. Archieratic. par. viii. obs. 4. p. 130. Tunc singuli, et quidem rari, non verò tam multi ac hodiè ordinabantur. [2] Leo Serm. ii. de Jejun. Pentecost. p. 77. It. Serm. ix. de Jejun. 7. Mensis, sive de Jejunio quatuor Temporum. p. 88. It Serm. vii. [3] Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 67. n. 15. [4] Quesnel ap. Pagi. ibid. [5] Book ii. chap. xi. sect. 2. [6] Pearson. Annal. Cypr. an. 250. n. 20. p. 25. [7] Pearson. ibid. n. 15.

Paulinus, who lived in the fourth century, was ordained on Christmas-day, as he himself informs us:[1] yet neither was that one of the four days, which afterwards became the stated times of ordination. The Roman Pontifical, under the name of Damasus, in the life of almost every bishop, takes notice of the ordinations, which they made in the Roman province, of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, during their whole lives; and always the ordinations are said to be made in the month of December; which, if that book were of any great authority, would prove, that there was one fixed time of ordination at Rome, but not four. But I confess, the credit of that book cannot much be depended upon for the history of the primitive ages one way or other, it being of much later date than the title pretends; and perhaps the author only spake of ancient things according to the custom of his own times, when one of these four times might be brought into use; which seems to have been before the time of Simplicius, Anno 467. For the Pontifical, in his life,[2] adds February to December; as it does also in the life of Gelasius. And in one of the Decrees of Gelasius[3] there are no less than five stated times of ordination appointed, viz. June, September, December, the beginning of Lent, and the middle of Lent, and Saturday in the evening, in all these times, to be the precise time of ordination. Amalarius Fortunatus[4] takes notice of the change, that was made in the time of Simplicius; telling us, that all the bishops of Rome before Simplicius made their ordinations

---

[1] Paulin. Ep. 6. ad Sever. p. 101. Die Domini, quo nasci carne dignatus est, repentinâ vi multitudinis - - - Presbyteratu initiatus sum. [2] Pontifical. Vit. Gelas. Hic fecit ordinationes in Urbe Româ tres, per Mensem Decembrem et Februarium. [3] Gelas. Ep. 9. ad Episc. Lucaniæ. c. 11. al. 13. Ordinationes etiam Presbyterorum et Diaconorum nisi certis temporibus et diebus exerceri non debent, id est, Quarti Mensis Jejunio, Septimi, et Decimi, sed et etiam Quadragesimalis initii, ac medianâ Quadragesimæ die, Sabbati Jejunio circa vesperam noverint celebrandas. [4] Amalar. de Offic. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 1. Primi Apostolici semper in Decembrio Mense consecrationes ministrabant usque ad Simplicium, qui fuit à B. Petro quadragesimus nonus. Ipse primus sacravit in Februario.—And Mr. Wharton in his Auctarium of Bp. Usher's Historia Dogmatica de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis, p. 363. Omnes Apostolicos à B. Petro, usque ad Simplicium Papam, ordinationes tantùm in Jejunio Decembris celebrâsse, adnotavit I. Carnotensis in Libro M.S. de Ecclesiast. Offic.

always in the month of December, and that he was the first that ordained in February. Which no doubt he had from the forementioned passages of the Pontifical, which in some places speaks of one, and in others of two solemn times of ordination, but never of four; which argues, that these four were not as yet determined when that book was written, which, with the interpolations that it has now, was not till after the time of Justinian, as learned men generally agree. So that I leave it to further inquiry, whether there were any such fixed times of ordination in the Church of Rome, as these authors mention, for four or five of the first centuries. In other Churches we read of none; but the instances, that have been produced, rather prove the contrary. The inquisitive reader will be able to furnish himself with many other such instances, from which it may be concluded, that the times of ordination were not fixed for four of the first centuries, since no ancient writer within that space makes any mention of them. And therefore there is no necessity, with Baronius,[1] and Bellarmine,[2] to make the *Jejunia quatuor temporum* an apostolical tradition; but it is sufficient to speak of them as an useful order of the Church, founded upon ecclesiastical institution some ages after.

SECT. 7.—Ordinations indifferently given on any Day of the Week for Three Centuries.

The same must be said in answer to the second question, whether Sunday was always the day of ordination? It is evident, that for the three first centuries it was not. For Mr. Pagi has unanswerably proved[3] against Papebrochius, from the most certain rules of chronology, that, before the time of Constantine, the ordinations of the bishops of Rome themselves were performed indifferently upon any day of the week, and that the affixing them to the Lord's Day, and other solemn festivals, was the business of the fourth century. So that, when Pope Leo says,[4] "that such ordinations, as were made upon other days than Sundays, were

[1] Baron. an. 57. n. 209. [2] Bellarm. de Verbo Dei non scripto. lib. iv. c. 3. p. 206. [3] Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 67. n. 14. et 16.
[4] Leo Ep. 91. ad Dioscorum, c. 1.

against the canons and the tradition of the fathers," he is to be understood, as before, to mean only the custom of his own times; if yet it was the custom when Leo lived: for there is some reason to doubt the authority either of Leo's Epistle, or that of Gelasius, who lived not long after. For Gelasius says,[1] "the ordinations of presbyters and deacons were to be made on Saturday, in the evening." So that either one of these Epistles is spurious, or else the custom varied in the same century in the Church of Rome.

SECT. 8.—The Ceremony usually performed in the Time of the Oblation at Morning-Service.

I confess Gelasius is singular in that part of his decree, which fixes ordinations to evening-service. For though the ancients were not always precise to a certain day of the year, or a certain day of the week; yet they more punctually observed the time of the day, to give ordinations at morning-service. This was a very ancient rule of the Church, as we may learn from the objection that was made against Novatian, that among his other irregularities he was ordained at an uncanonical hour, "*ὥρᾳ δεκάτῃ, at ten o'clock*, or *four in the afternoon*," as Cornelius,[2] in his Epistle to Fabian, lays the charge against him. The council of Laodicea[3] is still more punctual to the time, that ordinations should not be given, while the hearers or catechumens were present, but at the time of the oblation. The reason of which was, that the person ordained might either consecrate, or at least participate of the eucharist at the time of his ordination. Whence Theodoret, speaking of the ordination of Macedonius, the anchoret, says, it was done,[4] "*της μυστικῆς ἱερουργίας προκειμένης, in the time of the mystical*, that is, *the communion-service*." And so Epiphanius[5] represents the ordination of Paulinianus, St. Jerom's brother, whom he ordained presbyter, whilst he ministered in the holy sacrifice of the

[1] Gelas. Ep. 9. ad Epsic. Lucan. c. 11. Ordinationes Sabbati Jejunio circa Vesperam noverint celebrandas. [2] Ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. [3] Con. Laodic. c. 4. Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν τὰς χειροτονίας ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ ἀκροωμένων γίνεσθαι. [4] Theod. Hist. Relig. c. 13. [5] Epiphan. Ep. ad Johan. Hierosol. Cum ministraret in sanctis sacrificiis, ordinavimus Presbyterum.

altar. But this is to be understood chiefly, if not only, of the three superior orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons: for as to the rest, it was indifferent what time they were ordained, so long as it was in the Church in any part of divine service.

SECT. 9.—The Church the only Regular Place of Ordination.

But out of the Church no ordination could be regularly performed. Though there was this difference between the superior and inferior orders, that the one were conferred within the sanctuary, or altar part, and the other without; yet they both agreed in this, that the Church was still the proper place to give birth to all such orders, as were to be employed in any ecclesiastical service. And therefore Gregory Nazianzen justly upbraids Maximus, the cynic, who intruded himself into his see of Constantinople,[1] "that being excluded from the Church, he was ordained in the house of a minstrel;" which was also objected to Ursinus, who was competitor with Damasus for the see of Rome," that he was not ordained in a Church,[2] but in an obscure corner of the hall, called *Sicona*.

SECT. 10.—Ordination received kneeling at the Altar.

As to the ceremonies used in the act of ordination itself, beside what has been noted before in speaking of each particular order, it will be proper to observe some things of them in general. As first, that the ordinations of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, were always received kneeling before the altar. So the author under the name of Dionysius represents the matter in his Rationale upon the Church's service.[3] And Theodoret mentions it as the customary rite, when, speaking of the ordination of a bishop, he says,[4] "they brought him to the holy table, and made him kneel on his knees by force."

---

[1] Naz. Carm. de Vit. p. 15. Εἰς γὰρ χοραύλου λυπρὸν οἰκητήριον, Κυνῶν τυπῶσί τον κάκιστον ποιμένα. [2] Socrat. lib. iv. c. 29.
[3] Dionys. de Hierarch. Eccl. c. 5. Contempl. 3. n. 7 et. 8. [4] Theod. lib. iv. c. 15.

SECT. II.—Given by Imposition of Hands and Prayer.

Secondly, The solemnity itself in giving the superior orders was always performed by imposition of hands and prayer.[1] Which is evident from St. Jerom,[2] who says, "that imposition of hands was therefore added to complete the ordinations of the clergy, lest any one by a silent and solitary prayer should be ordained without his knowledge." Gregory Nyssen[3] indeed tells us a very strange story of the ordination of Gregory Thaumaturgus, how Phædimus, bishop of Amasea, ordained him only by prayer without imposition of hands; for he was absent, being fled to the wilderness, to avoid ordination. Notwithstanding which Phædimus consecrated him to the bishopric of Neo-Cæsarea, which he afterwards accepted. But as a learned man conjectures,[4] it is most likely that he had another ordination; or if not, this act must pass for a singular instance, contrary to the common rule and established order of the Church. The Greeks call this imposition of hands both Χειροτονία, and Χειροθεσία, as may be seen in the canons of the council of Nice and Chalcedon.[5] Yet sometimes those words are distinguished, as in the author of the Constitutions,[6] where he says, "Πρεσβύτερος χειροθετεῖ, ὁ χειροτονεῖ, *a presbyter gives imposition of hands, but does not ordain.*" Where it is plain, that imposition of hands means not ordination, but some other benediction of the Church, wherein imposition of hands was used, as well as in ordination. Neither does Χειροτονία always signify ordination in ancient writers; though it does most commonly so, as Fronto Ducæus[7] and other learned persons have showed; but sometimes it denotes no more than designation or election; as when Ignatius uses the phrase,[8] "Χειροτονῆσαι Θεοπρεσβύτην," only

[1] The Ordination-Prayers are spoken of by Greg. Naz. Orat. Fun. Patr. [2] Hieron. lib. xvi. in Isai. c. 58. p. 265. Χειροτονία, id est, Ordinatio Clericorum non solum ad imprecationem vocis, sed ad Impositionem impletur manûs: ne scilicet vocis imprecatio clandestina Clericos ordinet nescientes. [3] Nyssen. Vit. Greg. Thaum. tom. iii. p. 544. [4] Cave Hist. Literar. vol. i. p. 94. [5] Con. Nic. c. 19. Chalced. c. 15. [6] Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 28. [7] Fronto Ducæ. Not. in Chrysost. Hom. i. ad Pop. Antioch. p. 1. [8] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 11. It. Ep. ad Philadelph. n. 10. Ep. ad Polycarp. n. 7.

to signify the election or appointment of a messenger to go upon an errand of the Church. Which I note to caution the reader against mistakes committed by some authors, who confound ordinations with elections, for want of distinguishing the critical senses of words, as the subject matter requires.

SECT. 12.—The Sign of the Cross used in Ordination.

I must further observe, that as the sign of the cross was used upon many occasions by the primitive Christians, so particularly in their ordinations; which we learn from Chrysostom, who more than once mentions it upon this occasion. "If," says he,[1] "we are to be regenerated, the cross is used, viz. in baptism; or if we are to eat the mystical food, the eucharist;—or to receive an ordination, we are signed with the sign of the cross." Upon this account, Suicerus notes,[2] out of the author under the name of Dionysius, that the imposition of hands in ordination was called Σφραγὶς, *consignation*, and Σταυροειδὴς σφραγὶς, *consignation in form of a cross*,[3] because the sign of the cross was made on the head of him that was ordained.

SECT. 13.—But no Unction, nor the Ceremony of delivering Vessels into the Hands of Presbyters and Deacons.

As to the ceremony of unction, I have already had occasion to show its novelty in another place;[4] together with the custom of delivering some of the holy vessels into the hands of the person ordained; which, Habertus says, was never used in giving any of the superior orders, but only the inferior, by the rule of the fourth council of Carthage, which makes that the chief part of their ordination. Though Habertus[5] and some others question the authority of that very council, and reckon all its canons spurious. But that only by the way.

---

[1] Chrys. Hom. 55. in Matth. Κἂν ἀναγεννηθῆναι δέῃ, σταυρὸς παραγίνεται κἂν τραφῆναι τὴν μυστικὴν ἐκείνην τροφὴν κἂν χειροτονηθῆναι, &c.
[2] Suicer. Thesaur. Voce Σφραγὶς, tom. ii. p. 1199. [3] Dionys. de Hierarch Eccl. c. 5. p. 312 et 314. [4] Book ii. chap. xix. sect. 17. [5] Habert. Archieratic. p. 323.

SECT. 14.—Ordinations concluded with the Kiss of Peace.

When the ceremony of consecration was ended, it was usual for the clergy then present to salute the person, newly ordained, with the kiss of peace.[1] And so being conducted to his proper station belonging to his office, if he was a bishop or a presbyter, he made his first sermon to the people. But of this, as it relates to bishops, I have given an account before. As it relates to presbyters in the Greek Church, where it was more usual for presbyters to preach, the reader may find examples of such sermons among those of Chrysostom[2] and Gregory Nyssen,[3] which they preached upon the day of their ordination.

SECT. 15.—The Anniversary Day of a Bishop's Ordination kept a Festival.

I cannot omit to mention one thing more, which should have been mentioned in another place, because it was an honour peculiarly paid to the order of bishops; which was, that in many places the day of their ordination was solemnly kept among the anniversary festivals of the Church. On these days they had church-assemblies, and sermons, and all the other solemnities of a festival. Which appears from St. Austin's sermons,[4] two of which were preached upon the anniversary of his own ordination; and in another,[5] published by Sirmondus, he also mentions the day under the same title of his own anniversary. In a fourth he speaks also of the anniversary of Aurelius,[6] bishop of Carthage, inviting the people to come and keep the festival in *Basilica Fausti*, which was a noted church in Carthage. Among the Homilies also of Leo, bishop of Rome, the three first are upon the anniversary day of his assumption to the pontificate. And a late learned critic[7] has observed, that in St. Jerom's, and some other ancient

---

[1] Dionys. Hierarch. Eccl. c. 5. p. 367. Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 5. [2] Chrys. Hom. cùm Presbyter esset designatus. tom. iv. p. 953. [3] Nyssen. Hom. in suam Ordinat. tom. ii. [4] Aug. Hom. 24 et 25. ex quinquaginta. [5] Hom. 39. edit. à Sirmond. tom. x. p. 841. [6] Hom. 32. de Verb. Dni. Dies anniversarius ordinationis Domini Senis Aurelii crastinus illucescit. Rogat et admonet per humilitatem meam charitatem vestram, ut ad Basilicam Fausti devotissimè venire dignemini. [7] Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 67. n. 14.

martyrologies, there sometimes occur such festivals under the titles of, *Ordinatio Episcopi, et Natale Episcopatûs*, that is, *the ordination or birth-day of such or such a bishop.* Which, doubtless, at first were the anniversaries of their ordination, which they themselves kept in their life-time; and which were continued in memory of them after death; by which means they came to be inserted into the martyrologies as standiug festivals, denoting there neither the day of their natural birth, nor their death (as some mistake,) but the day of their ordination, or advancement to the episcopal throne. But of this more when we come to speak of the festivals of the Church.

CHAP. VII.

The Case of Forced Ordinations and Re-ordinations considered.

SECT. 1.—Forced Ordinations very frequent in the Primitive Church.

FOR the close of this book I shall add something concerning forced ordinations, and re-ordinations, which were things that very often happened in the primitive Church. For anciently, while popular elections were indulged, there was nothing more common than for the people to take men by force, and have them ordained even against their wills. For though, as Sulpicius Severus complains, many men were too ambitious in courting the preferments of the Church; yet there were some, who ran as eagerly from them as others ran to them; and nothing but force could bring such men to submit to an ordination. We have seen an instance or two of this already, in the cases of St. Austin[1] and Paulinus: and ecclesiastical history affords us many others. For, not to mention such as only fled or absconded to avoid ordination; such as Cyprian,[2] and Gregory Thaumaturgus,[3] and Athanasius,[4] and Evagrius,[5] and St. Ambrose;[6] there were some, who were plainly ordained

[1] See before chap. ii. sect. 8. [2] Pontius Vit. Cypr. [3] Greg. Nyssen. Vit. Greg. Thaumaturg. [4] Sozomen. lib. ii. c. 17. [5] Socrat. lib. iv. c. 23. [6] Paulin. Vit. Ambros.

against their wills; as Nepotian, of whom St. Jerom says,[1] "that, when his uncle Heliodore ordained him presbyter, he wept and lamented his condition, and could not forbear expressing his anger against his ordainer, though that was the only time he ever had occasion to do it." St. Martin, bishop of Tours, was so averse from taking the bishopric, that he was forced to be drawn out of his cell by craft, and carried under a guard to his ordination, as the sacred historian informs us[2]. And the ordination of Macedonius, the anchoret, by Flavian, bishop of Antioch, was so much against his will, that they durst not let him know what they were about, till the ceremony was over; and when he came to understand that he was ordained presbyter, he broke forth into a rage against Flavian, and all that were concerned in the action, as thinking that his ordination would have obliged him to another sort of life, and deprived him of his retirement and return to the mountains. So Theodoret, in his lives of the eastern anchorets,[3] relates the story. And that this was a very common practice in those times, appears from what Epiphanius says of the custom in Cyprus,[4] "That it was usual, in that province, for persons that fled to avoid ordination by their own bishop, to be seized by any other bishop, and to be ordained by them, and then be returned to the bishop, from whom they were fled." Which argues, that forced ordinations in those times were both practised and allowed.

SECT. 2.—No Excuse admitted in that Case, except a Man protested upon Oath that he would not be ordained.

Nor was it any kind of remonstrance or solicitation whatsoever, which the party could make, that would prevent his ordination in such cases, except he chanced to protest

[1] Hieron. Ep. 3. Epitaph. Nepotian, presbyter ordinatur, Jesu bone, qui gemitus, qui ejulatus, quæ cibi interdictio, quæ fuga oculorum omnium! tunc primum et solum avunculo iratus est. [2] Sulp. Sever. Vit. St. Martin. lib. i. p. 224. Dispositis in itinere civium turbis, sub quâdam custodiâ ad civitatem usque deducitur, &c. [3] Theod. Hist. Relig. c. 13. [4] Epiph. Ep. ad Johan. Hierosol. Multi Episcoporum communionis nostræ et Presbyteros in nostrâ ordinaverunt provinciâ, quos nos comprehendere non poteramus, et miserunt ad nos Diaconos et Hypodiaconos, quos suscepimus cum gratiâ.

solemnly upon oath against ordination. For in that case he was to be set at liberty, and not to be ordained against so solemn a protestation. This is evident from one of the canons of St. Basil, which says,[1] "that they, who swear they will not be ordained, are not to be compelled to forswear themselves by being ordained." And this, I think, also may be collected from the account, which Epiphanius gives of his own transaction with Paulinianus, St. Jerom's brother, upon such an occasion. "Paulinianus," he says, "was one of those, who fled from their bishop for fear of ordination; but providentially coming,[2] where Epiphanius was, he caused him to be seized by his deacons, not dreaming or suspecting any thing of ordination; and when he came to it, he caused them to hold his mouth, for fear he should have adjured him by the name of Christ to set him free." Thus he ordained him deacon first, and presbyter sometime after in the very same manner. Which seems to imply, that, if he had suffered him to have made his protestation in the name of Christ, he could not have proceeded to his ordination. But, it seems, nothing else but such an adjuration was available to set him free: and that is a further argument, that in those times men might be ordained against their wills, and yet their ordinations stand good, and be accounted as valid as any others.

SECT. 3.—This Practice afterward prohibited by the Imperial Laws, and Canons of the Church.

But in the next age this practice was prohibited, because of several inconveniences that were found to attend it. The emperors Leo and Majorian made a law with sanctions and penalties to prevent it; for they decreed,[3] "that no one should be ordained against his will." And, whereas

---

[1] Basil. Ep. Canon. ad Amphiloch. c. 10. Οἱ ὀμνύοντες μὴ καταδίχεσθαι τὴν χειροτονίαν, ἐξομνύμενοι μὴ ἀναγκαζέσθωσαν ἐπιορκεῖν. [2] Epiphan. Ibid. Ignorantem eum, et nullam penitùs habentem suspicionem, per multos Diaconos apprehendi jussimus, et teneri os ejus, ne fortè liberari se cupiens, adjuraret nos per nomen Christi, &c. [3] Leo. Novel. 2. in Append. Cod. Theod. Non nullorum persuasio Sacerdotum reluctantibus onus istud imponit, &c. Eo ergò licentiam hujus præsumptionis excludimus, ut si quispiam probatus fuerit vi coactus sub contumeliâ publicâ clericatûs officiis successisse, spontaneis accusatoribus, vel si ipse voluerit allegare perpessam

some bishops did impose the burthen of orders upon men against their consent, they granted liberty in that case, either to the party himself, or any other accuser to bring an action at law against the archdeacon; who was liable to be fined ten pounds of gold, to be paid to the injured party, or to the informers, or to the states of the city. The bishop also was to be censured by his superiors, and the party ordained to be set at liberty, as if he had never been ordained. Pursuant to this law, John, bishop of Ravenna, for a transgression of this kind, was threatened to be deprived of the power of ordination by Simplicius,[1] bishop of Rome, anno 482. And the third council of Orleans,[2] anno 538, made a decree for the French Churches, "that if any bishop ordained a clerk against his will, he should do penance for the fact a whole year, and remain suspended from his office till that term was expired." So great an alteration was there made in one age in the rules and practice of the Church, from what they had been in the former.

SECT. 4.—Yet a Bishop Ordained against his Will, had not the Privilege to relinquish.

But I must note, that, after this correction was made, there was still some difference to be observed between the forced ordination of a bishop, and that of an inferior clerk, presbyter, deacon, or any other. For though the forementioned imperial law gave liberty to all inferiors, so ordained, to relinquish their office, which was forced upon them, if they pleased, and betake themselves to a secular life again; yet it peremptorily denied this privilege to bishops, decreeing,[3] that their ordination should stand good; and that no action, brought against their ordainers, should be of force to evacuate or disannul their consecration. Which seems to

licentiam, commodemus apud judices competentes hujusmodi admissa damnare, ut si inter leges objecta constiterint, decem libras auri Archidiaconus cogatur inferre ei qui pertulerit exsolvendas: dehinc si ille desistit, accusatoris censibus et civitatis ordini profuturas: illo suæ reddito voluntati, qui coactus non potuit consecrari, &c. [1] Simplic. Ep. 2. ad Johan. Ravennatens. [2] Con. Aurelian. iii. c. 7. Episcopus qui invitum vel reclamantem præsumpserit ordinare, annuali pœnitentiæ subditus Missas facere non præsumat. [3] Leo Novel. 2. Ibid. Si qui sanè Episcopus invitus fuerit ordinatus, hanc consecrationem nullâ violari accusatione permittimus.

be grounded upon that ancient rule of the Church, mentioned in the council of Antioch,[1] and confirmed in the council of Chalcedon,[2] "that if any bishop was ordained to a Church, to which he refused to go, he should be excommunicated till he complied, or something were determined in his case by a provincial synod." Which seems to authorise the using a sort of violence in compelling men to undergo the burthen of the episcopal function; agreeably to that other law of Leo and Anthemius in the Justinian Code,[3] which puts this among other qualifications of a bishop, that he shall be so far from ambition, as to be one rather that must be sought for and compelled to take a bishopric. Such were anciently the laws of Church and State relating to forced ordinations.

SECT. 5.—Re-ordinations generally condemned.

As to re-ordinations, before we can answer to the question about them, we must distinguish between the orders, that were given regularly and canonically by persons rightly qualified in the Church, and such, as were given irregularly by persons unqualified, or by heretics and schismatics, out of the Church. As to such orders as were given regularly in the Church, they were supposed, like baptism, to impress a sort of indelible character, so as that there was no necessity upon any occasion to repeat them; but on the contrary it was deemed a criminal act so to do. The third council of Carthage,[4] following the steps of the plenary council of Capua, or Capsa, decreed, "that it was equally unlawful to re-baptize and re-ordain." And those called the Apostolical Canons[5] make it deposition both for the ordainer and ordained to give or receive a second ordination. St. Austin says,[6] it was not the custom of the Catholic Church to repeat either orders or baptism. For

---

[1] Con. Antioch. c. 17. [2] Con. Chalced. Act. 11. [3] Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 31. Tantum ab ambitu debet esse sepositus, ut quæratur cogendus, &c. [4] Con. Carth. iii. c. 38. In Capsensi plenariâ Synodo statutum, quod non liceat fieri rebaptizationes, et reordinationes, vel translationes Episcoporum. [5] Canon. Apost. c. 67. [6] Aug. Cont. Parmen, lib, ii. c. 13. In Catholicâ utrumque non licet iterari,

men did not lose their orders,[1] as to the internal character and virtue, though they were suspended from the execution of their office for some misdemeanor. Optatus testifies the same, telling us,[2] "that Donatus was condemned in the council of Rome under Melchiades, for re-ordaining such bishops, as had lapsed in time of persecution; which was contrary to the custom of the Catholic Church." And others accuse the Arians[3] upon the same account, for re-ordaining such of the Catholic clergy, as went over to their party.

SECT. 6.—The Proposal made by Cæcilian to the Donatists, examined.

There is indeed a passage in Optatus, concerning Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, which at first view seems to import, as if Cæcilian had been willing to have submitted to a re-ordination. For Optatus says,[4] "Cæcilian sent this message to the Donatist bishops, that, if Felix had given him no true ordination, as they pretended, they should ordain him again, as if he were still only a deacon." But St. Austin, who perhaps best understood Cæcilian's meaning,[5] says, "he only spoke this ironically to deride them, not that he intended to submit to a second ordination, but because he was certain, that Felix and the rest of his ordainers were no traditors, as they accused them." So that we have no instances of re-ordaining such, as were regularly ordained, in the Catholic Church; it being esteemed "unlawful," as Theodoret words it,[6] "to give any man the same ordination twice." Whence neither in the translation of bishops from one Church to another do we ever read of a new ordination,

---

[1] Id. de Bona Conjugal. c. xxiv. tom. vi. Manet in illis ordinatis sacramentum ordinationis; et si aliquâ culpâ quisquam ab officio removeatur, sacramento Domini semel imposito non carebit, &c. [2] Optat. lib. i. p. 44. In Donatum sunt hæ sententiæ latæ. Quod confessus sit se rebaptizâsse, et Episcopis lapsis manum imposuisse; quod ab ecclesiâ alienum est. [3] Vid. Vales. Not. in Sozom. lib. vi. c. 26. ex Marcellin. Libel. Precum. [4] Optat. lib. i. p. 41. A Cæciliano mandatum est, ut si Felix in se, sicut illi arbitrabantur, nihil contulisset, ipsi tanquam adhuc Diaconum ordinarent Cæcilianum. [5] Aug. Brevic. Collat. Die iii. c. 16. Quod quidem si dictum est, ideò dici potuit ad illos deridendos, quibus hoc mandâsse perhibetur, quoniam certus erat ordinatores suos non esse traditores. [6] Theod. Histor. Relig. c. 13. Ὀυ δυνατὸν δὶς τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπιτιθεῖναι χειροτονίαν.

but only of an enthronization or instalment; as of a new matriculation of presbyters and deacons, when they were taken out of one Church to be settled in another. Cyprian,[1] speaking of his admission of Numidicus into his own Church from another, where he was presbyter before, does not say, he gave him a new ordination, but only a name and a seat among the presbyters of Carthage. And this was the constant practice of the Church, in all such cases, for any thing that appears to the contrary.

SECT. 7.—Schismatics sometimes re-ordained.

As to such, as were ordained out of the Church by schismatical or heretical bishops, the case was a little different. For the Church did not always allow of their ordinations, but sometimes for discipline's sake, and to put a mark of infamy upon their errors, made them take a new ordination. This was decreed by the great council of Nice in the case of those bishops and presbyters, whom Meletius, the schismatic, ordained in Egypt, after he had been deposed by his metropolitan of Alexandria. "They were not to be admitted to serve in the Catholic Church, till they were first authorised by a more sacred ordination,"[2] as that council words it in her Synodical Epistle or Directions to the Church of Alexandria. In pursuance of this decree, Theodore, bishop of Oxyrinchus, re-ordained the Meletian presbyters upon their return to the Church; as Valesius[3] shows out of Marcellinus, and Faustinus's petition to the emperor Theodosius: and other learned men[4] are of the same opinion. Yet in some cases the Church consented to receive schismatical bishops and presbyters without obliging them to take a new ordination. As in Afric, St. Austin[5] assures us, it was the custom to allow of the ordinations of

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. xxxv. al. 40. Admonitos nos et instructos sciatis dignatione divinâ, ut Numidicus Presbyter adscribatur Presbyterorum Carthaginiensium numero, et nobiscum sedeat in Clero. [2] Ep. Synod. ap. Socrat. lib. i. c. 9, Et Theod. lib. i. c. 9. Μυστικωτέρᾳ χειροτονίᾳ βεβαιωθέντας, &c. [3] Vales. Not. in Socrat. lib. i. c. 9. [4] Du Pin Biblioth. Cent. iv. p. 251. [5] Aug. Cont. Parmen. lib. ii. c. 13. Si visum est opus esse, ut eadem officia gererent quæ gerebant, non sunt rursus ordinati, sed sicut baptismus in eis, ita ordinatio mansit integra, &c. Vid. Cont. Crescon. lib. ii. c. 11. It. Ep. 50. p. 87. Ep. 162. p. 279.

the Donatists, and to admit them to officiate in whatever station they served before their return to the unity of the Church, without repeating their ordination any more than their baptism. He repeats this in several places of his writings. And that it was so, appears both from the canons of the African councils,[1] and the concessions made in the Collation of Carthage,[2] where the proposal was, "that the Donatist bishops should enjoy their honours and dignities, if they would return to the unity of the Catholic Church." This had before been determined in the Roman council, under Melchiades, where the Donatists had their first hearing. For there, as St. Austin informs us,[3] it was also decreed, "that only Donatus, the author of the schism, should be cashiered; but for all the rest, though they were ordained out of the Church, they should be received upon their repentance, in the very same offices and quality, which they enjoyed before." So that the rigour of Church discipline was quickened, or abated in this respect, according as the benefit or necessities of the Church seemed to require.

SECT. 8.—And Heretics also upon their Return to the Church, in some Places.

And the treatment of persons ordained by heretics was much of the same nature. Some canons require all such without exception to be re-ordained. It was so in the Greek Church, at the time when those called the Apostolical Canons were made. For the same Canon,[4] that condemns re-ordinations in the Church, makes an exception in the case of such as were ordained by heretics; pronouncing their ordination void, and requiring them to be ordained again. And this was generally the practice of all those Churches, in the third century, which denied the validity of heretical baptism; for by much stronger reason they denied their ordinations. Therefore Firmilian, who was of this opinion, tells us also, that the council of Ico-

[1] Cod. Can. Afric. c. 69 et 70. [2] Collat. Carth. Die i. c. 16.
[3] Aug. Ep. 50. ad Bonifac. p. 87. Damnato uno quodam Donato, qui Author Schismatis fuisse manifestatus est, cæteros correctos, etiamsi extra Ecclesiam ordinati essent, in suis honoribus recipiendos esse censuerunt. [4] Canon. Apost. c. 67.

nium,[1] Anno 256, decreed, "that heretics had no power to minister either baptism, or confirmation, or ordination. Nay some of those, who allowed the baptism of heretics, yet still continued to condemn their ordinations. As Innocent,[2] bishop of Rome, who determines against such as were ordained by the Arians and such other heretics, "that they were not to be admitted with their honours in the Catholic Church; though their baptism might stand good, being administered in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In another place he says,[3] it was the ancient rule of the Church of Rome to cancel and disannul all such ordinations; though in some places, he owns, they were allowed: for Anisius, bishop of Thessalonica, with a council of his provincial bishops, agreed to receive those, whom Bonosus, an heretical bishop of Macedonia,[4] had ordained; "that they might not continue to strengthen his party, and thereby bring no small damage upon the Church." Liberius not only admitted the Macedonian bishops to communion, but also allowed them to continue in their office, upon their subscription to the Nicene Creed, and abjuration of their former heresy; as Socrates,[5] and Sozomen,[6] and St. Basil,[7] and others testify. In France the custom was, in the time of Clodoveus, to give a new imposition of hands to the Arian clergy, that returned to

---

[1] Firmil. Ep. 75. ap. Cyprian, p. 221. Hæretico sicut ordinare non licet, nec manum imponere, ita nec Baptizare.—Vid. Cypr. Ep. 72. ad Stephan. p. 197. [2] Innoc. Ep. 18. ad Alexand. c. 3. Non videtur Clericos eorum cum sacerdotii aut ministerii cujuspiam suscipi debere dignitate; quoniam iis solum baptisma ratum esse permittimus, &c. [3] Id. Ep. 22. ad Episc. Macedon. c. 5. Anisii quondam fratris nostri, aliorumque Consacerdotum summa deliberatio hæc fuit, ut quos Bonosus ordinaverat, ne cum eodem remanerent, ac ne fieret mediocre scandalum, ordinati reciperentur. - - - - Jam ergò quod pro remedio ac necessitate temporis statutum est, constat primitùs non fuisse. [4] Bonosus is called bishop of Macedonia, not because he was of the province of Macedonia, but of the larger district called, the diocese of Macedonia, in the Notitiæ of the empire and the Church. Learned men were a long time at a loss to tell, what see he was bishop of. Baronius and Petavius profess themselves entirely ignorant of it; Christianus Lupus says, he was bishop of Sirmium; but since Garnerius published the works of Marius Mercator, it appears that he was bishop of Sardica: for Mercator gives him the title of Bonosus Sardicensis. [5] Socrat. lib. iv. c. 12. [6] Sozom. lib. vi. c. 10. [7] Basil. Ep. 74. ad Episcop. Occident.

the Catholic Faith; as appears from the first council of Orleans, which made a decree about it.[1] But that perhaps does not mean a new ordination, but only such a reconciliatory imposition of hands, as was used to be given to penitents in absolution. But if otherwise, it proves that the Church had different methods of proceeding in this case, as she judged it most expedient and beneficial for her service; sometimes reversing and disannulling the ordinations of heretics for discipline's sake, and to show her resentments of their errors; and sometimes allowing them to stand good for her own sake, to prevent greater scandals, and to encourage the straying people to return with their leaders to the unity of the Catholic Faith. Upon which account the general-council of Ephesus made an order concerning the Massalian heretics, otherwise called Euchites and enthusiasts,[2] "that if any of their clergy would return to the Church, and in writing anathematize their former errors, they should continue in the same station they were in before; otherwise they should be degraded, and enjoy neither clerical promotion nor communion in the Church." The council of Nice is thought to have made the like decree in favour of the Novatian clergy,[3] only giving them a reconciliatory imposition of hands by way of absolution, not re-ordination. And there is nothing more certain, than that the African Fathers so treated the Donatists; particularly St. Austin, in all his writings, pleads as much for the validity of heretical ordinations, as heretical baptism; and says further,[4] "that when the Church judged it expedient not to suffer the Donatist bishops to officiate upon their return to the Church, she did not thereby intend to deny the reality

---

[1] Con. Aurel. i. c. 12. De Hæreticis Clericis, qui ad Fidem Catholicam plenâ fide et voluntate venerint, id censuimus observari - - - ut officium, quo eos Episcopus dignos esse censuerit, cum impositæ manûs benedictione suscipiant. [2] Con. Ephes. Act. 7. Decret. cont. Messalian. tom. iii. p. 809. Si Clerici fuerint, maneant Clerici. - - - Quod si renuerint anathematizare, si Presbyteri, vel Diaconi fuerint, vel in alio quopiam gradu Ecclesiæ, excidant et à Clero et à Gradu et à Communione. [3] Con. Nic. c. 8. [4] Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. c. 13. Cùm expedire hoc judicatur Ecclesiæ, ut Præpositi eorum venientes ad Catholicam Societatem, honores suos ibi non administrent; non eis tamen ipsa ordinationis sacramenta detrahuntur, sed manent super eos.

or validity of their ordination, but supposed that to remain still perfect and entire in them." And this is what St. Austin meant by the sacrament of ordination, as he words it, or the indelible character, which was thereby imprinted; that though a man turned apostate, or was suspended or deprived for any crime, yet, if upon his repentance and satisfaction, the Church thought fit to admit him to officiate again, there was no necessity of giving him a new ordination, no more than a new baptism; for the character of both remained entire. This was the doctrine and practice of the African Church, and most others, in the time of St. Austin.

BOOK V.

OF THE PRIVILEGES, IMMUNITIES, AND REVENUES OF THE CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Some Instances of Respect, which the Clergy paid mutually to one another.

Sect. 1.—The Clergy obliged to give Entertainment to their Brethren, travelling upon necessary Occasions.

Having thus far discoursed of the necessary qualifications of the clergy, and the several customs observed in the designation of them to the ministerial office; it will be proper in the next place to speak of the respect and honour, that was generally paid them upon the account of their office. Under which head I shall comprise whatever relates to the privileges, exemptions, immunities, and revenues of the ancient clergy. Some particular marks of honour, as they were peculiar to this or that order, have already been mentioned in speaking of those orders; but now I shall treat of those, which were more universal, and common to all orders. And here it will not be amiss in the first place to say something of that courteous treatment and friendship, wherewith the clergy of the ancient Church were obliged to receive and embrace one another. Two or three instances of which it will be sufficient to observe at present. First, that wherever they travelled upon necessary occasions, they were to be entertained by their brethren of the clergy in all places, out of the public revenues of the Church; and it was a sort of crime for a bishop or other clerk to refuse the hospitality

of the Church, and take it from any other. The historians, Socrates and Sozomen,[1] tacitly reflect upon Epiphanius for an action of this nature, "that when he came to Constantinople, where Chrysostom showed him all imaginable respect and honour, sending his clergy out to meet him, and inviting him to an apartment according to custom in his house, he refused the civility, and took up his habitation in a separate mansion." This was interpreted the same thing as breaking Catholic communion with him; as it proved in effect; for he came on purpose, by the instigations of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, to form an accusation against him. On the other hand, to deny any of the clergy the hospitality of the Church, upon such occasions, was a more unpardonable crime, and looked upon as the rudest way of denying communion. Therefore Firmilian[2] smartly reproves the behaviour of Pope Stephen, both as insolent and unchristian, towards the African bishops, who were sent as legates from their Churches to him, "That he neither admitted them to audience himself, nor suffered any of the brethren to receive them to his house; so not only denying them the peace and communion of the Church, but the civility of Christian entertainment also." Which was so much the greater despite and affront to them, because every private Christian, travelling with letters of credence from his own Church, might have challenged that privilege upon the "contesseration of hospitality," as Tertullian[3] words it; and much more the bishops and clergy from one another. By the laws of the African Church, every bishop, that went as legate of a provincial synod to that which they called a general or plenary synod, was to be provided of all things necessary in his travels from this liberality of the Church; as appears from a canon in the third council of Carthage, which orders,[4] that no province should send above two or three legates; "that so they might appear with less pomp and envy, and be less charge to their entertainers."

[1] Socrat. lib. vi. c. 12. Sozom. lib. viii. c. 14. [2] Firmil. Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. p. 228. Ut venientibus non solum pax et communio, sed et tectum et hospitium negaretur. [3] Tertul. de Præscript. c. 20. [4] Con. Carth. 3. c. 2. Ut et minus invidiosi, minusque hospitibus sumptuosi existant.

This implies, that every Church was obliged, by custom at least, to give them entertainment in their passage.

SECT. 2.—And to give them the Honorary Privilege of Consecrating the Eucharist in the Church.

Another instance of customary respect, which the clergy were obliged to show to one another, was, that when any bishop or presbyter came to a foreign Church, they were to be complimented with the honorary privilege of performing divine offices, and consecrating the eucharist in the Church. This was a very ancient custom, as appears from what Irenæus says of Anicetus, bishop of Rome, that when Polycarp came to settle the paschal controversy with him, "παρεχώρησεν τὴν ἐυχαριστίαν τῳ Πολυκάρπῳ,"[1] which does not barely signify, "*he gave him the eucharist*," as the first translators of Eusebius render it; but, "*he gave place to him*, or *liberty to consecrate the eucharist in his Church*." The council of Arles, which turned this custom into a law, uses the very same expression about it[2], "That in every Church they should give place to the bishop, that was a stranger, to offer the oblation or sacrifice." And the fourth council of Carthage more plainly,[3] "That a bishop or presbyter, visiting another Church, shall be received, each in their own degree, and be invited to preach, and consecrate the oblation." So they were to be admitted to all the honours, which the Church could show them; the bishop was to seat his fellow-bishop in the same throne with himself, and the presbyters to do the same by their fellow-presbyters. For that the canon means by receiving them in their own degree. Which custom is referred to by the Catholic bishops in the Collation of Carthage,[4] where they promise the Donatist bishops, "that if they would return to the Church, they should be treated by them as fellow-bishops, and sit upon the same thrones with them, as

[1] Iren. Ep. ad Victor. ap. Euseb. lib. v. c. 24. [2] Con. Arelat. i. c. 20. Ut peregrino Episcopo locus sacrificandi detur. [3] Con. Carth. 4. c. 33. Ut Episcopi vel Presbyteri, si causâ visendæ Ecclesiæ alterius Episcopi, ad Ecclesiam venerint, et in gradu suo suscipiantur, et tam ad verbum faciendum, quam ad oblationem consecrandam invitentur. [4] Collat. Carth. Die 1. c. 16. Sicut peregrino Episcopo juxta considente collegâ.

strangers were used to do." The author of the Constitutions joins all these things together, saying, "Let the bishop that is a stranger sit with the bishop, and be invited to preach; let him also be permitted to offer the eucharist; or, if in modesty he refuses it, let him at least be constrained to give the blessing to the people."

SECT. 3.—The Use of the *Literæ Formatæ*, or Commendatory Letters in this Respect.

But then it is to be observed, that these honours were not to be showed to strangers, as mere strangers, but as they could some ways give proof of their orthodoxy and catholicism to the Church, to which they came. And in this respect the *Literæ Systaticæ*, or *commendatory letters*, as they called them, were of great use and service in the Church. For no strange clergyman was to be admitted so much as to communicate, much less to officiate, without these letters of his bishop, in any Church where he was a perfect stranger, for fear of surreptitious, or passive communion, as the Canons call it.[1] And bishops were under the same obligations to take the letters of their metropolitan, if they had occasion to travel into a foreign country, where they could not otherwise be known. The third council of Carthage has a canon to this purpose,[2] "that no bishop should go beyond sea, without consulting the primate of his province, that he might have his *Formatæ*, or *letters of commendation*. And that the same discipline was observed in all Churches, seems clear from one of those canons of the Greek Church, among those which go by the name of Apostolical,[3] which says, "No strange bishops, presbyters, or deacons shall be received ἄνευ συστατικῶν, *unless they bring commendatory letters with them;* but without them, they shall only be provided of necessaries, and not be admitted to communicate, because many things are surrepti-

[1] Con. Carth. I. c. 7. Clericus vel Laicus non communicet in alienâ plebe sine literis Episcopi sui. Nisi hoc observatum fuerit, communio fiet passiva. Vid. Con. Laodicen. c. 41. Con. Antioch. c. 7. Agathens. c. 38. Chalced. c. 11.
[2] Con. Carth. iii. c. 28. Ut Episcopi trans mare non proficiscantur, nisi consulto Primæ Sedis Episcopo, ut ab Episcopo præcipuè (leg. Præcipuo) possint sumere Formatam vel Commendationem.
[3] Canon. Apost. c. 11.

tiously obtained." The translation of Dionysius Exiguus indeed denies them necessaries also; but that is a manifest corruption of the Greek text, which allows them to communicate in outward good things, but not in the communion of the Church. And this is what some think the ancients meant by, *Communio Peregrina, the communion of strangers;* when such, as travelled without letters of credence, were hospitably entertained, and provided of sustenance, but not admitted to participate of the eucharist, because they had no testimonials of their life and conversation. But others give a different account of this, which I shall more nicely examine, when I come to speak of the discipline of the Church, under which head the *Communio Peregrina* will come to be considered, as a species of ecclesiastical censure.

SECT. 4.—The Clergy obliged to end all their own Controversies among themselves.

A third instance of respect, which the clergy showed to one another, was, that if any controversies happened among themselves, they freely consented to have them determined by their bishops and councils, without having recourse to the secular magistrate for justice. Bishops, as I have had occasion to show before,[1] were anciently authorized by the imperial laws to hear, and determine secular pecuniary causes, even among laymen, when both the litigants would agree upon compromise to take them for arbitrators. But among the clergy there needed no such particular compromise; for by the rules and canons of the Church they were brought under a general obligation not to molest one another before a secular magistrate, but to end all their controversies under the cognizance of an ecclesiastical tribunal. The case was somewhat different when a layman and a clergyman had occasion to go to law together; for then the layman was at liberty to choose his court, and was not obliged to refer his cause to any ecclesiastical judge, unless by compromise he brought himself

[1] Book ii. chap. vii.

under such an obligation. For so the imperial laws in this case had provided.[1] Though in France, in the time of the Gothic kings, it was otherwise; for laymen there were not to sue a clerk in a secular court, without the bishop's permission; as appears from a canon of the council of Agde,[2] made under Alaric, Anno 506, which equally forbids a clergyman to sue a layman in a secular court, or to answer to any action brought against him there, without the bishop's permission. But whatever difference there was betwixt the Roman and Gothic laws in this particular, it is evident, that as to any controversies arising among the clergy themselves, they were to be determined before ecclesiastical judges; as appears from a canon of the council of Chalcedon, which is in these words,[3] "If any clergyman hath a controversy with another, he shall not leave his own bishop, and betake himself to any secular court, but first have a hearing before his own bishop, or such arbitrators as both parties should choose with the bishop's approbation: otherwise he should be liable to canonical censure." Which censure, in the African Church, was the loss of his place, whether he were bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any other inferior clerk, that declined the sentence of an ecclesiastical court, either in a civil or criminal cause, and betook himself to a secular court for justice. Though he carried his cause, and sentence were given on his side, in a criminal action, yet he was to be deposed; or if it was a civil cause, he must lose whatever advantage he gained by the action, as the third council of Carthage,[4] in this case, determined;

---

[1] Valentin. Novel. 12. ad Calcem Cod. Th. In Clerico petitore consequens erit, ut secundum leges pulsati forum sequatur, si adversarius suus ad Episcopi vel Presbyteri audientiam non præstat adsensum. [2] Con. Agathens. c. 32. Clericus nec quenquam præsumat apud secularem judicem, Episcopo non permittente, pulsare. Sed si pulsatus fuerit, non respondeat, nec proponat, nec audeat criminale negotium in judicio seculari proponere.
[3] Con. Chalced. c. 9. Ἐι τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πρᾶγμα ἔχει, μὴ ἐγκαταλιμπανέτω τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια καταφευγέτω, &c. [4] Con. Carth. iii. c. 9. Quisquis Episcoporum, Presbyterorum, et Diaconorum, seu Clericorum, cùm in ecclesiâ ei crimen fuerit intentatum, vel civilis causa fuerit commota, si derelicto ecclesiastico judicio publicis judiciis purgari voluerit, etiamsi pro ipso prolata fuerit sententia, Locum suum amittat, et hoc in criminali actione. In civili verò perdat, quod evicerit, si locum suum obtinere maluerit, &c.

because he despised the whole Church, in that he could not confide in any ecclesiastical persons to be his judges. Many other councils determined the same thing, as that of Vannes,[1] Chalons,[2] and Mascon.[3] And the council of Milevis decreed,[4] "that no one should petition the emperor to assign him secular judges, but only ecclesiastical, under pain of deprivation." So great confidence did the clergy generally place in one another, and pay such a deference to the wisdom, integrity, and judgment of their brethren, that it was then thought they had no need to have recourse to secular courts for justice, but they were willing to determine all controversies of their own among themselves. And as the imperial laws did not hinder this, but encourage it; so we seldom find any ecclesiastics inclined to oppose it, but either some factious and turbulent men, or such whose crimes had made them so obnoxious, that they had reason to dread an ecclesiastical censure.

Sect. 5.—What Care was taken in receiving Accusations against the Bishops and Clergy of the Church.

I shall but observe one thing more upon this head, which is, the great care the clergy had of the reputation and character of one another; which being a sacred and necessary thing in persons of their function, they did not think fit to let it be exposed to the malicious calumnies and slanders of every base and false accuser. But first in all accusations, especially against bishops, the testimony of two or three witnesses was required, according to the rule of the Apostle. Therefore, when the Synod of Antioch proceeded to condemn Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, upon a single testimony, the historian censures it,[5] as an arbitrary proceeding in them against that apostolical canon,—"Receive not an accusation against an elder, but before two or three witnesses." Secondly, the character of the witnesses was to be examined, before their testimony was to be allowed of. An

---

[1] Con. Venetic. c. 9. [2] Con. Cabillon. c. 11. [3] Con. Matiscon. c. 5. [4] Con. Milev. c. 19. Quicunque ab imperatore cognitionem judiciorum publicorum petierit, Honore proprio privetur. Si autem episcopale judicium ab Imperatore postulaverit, nihil ei obsit.
[5] Theod. Hist. lib. i. c. 20.

eretic was not to give evidence against a bishop, as may e collected from those Canons which bear the name of the postles, one of which joins these two things together;[1] Receive not an heretic to testify against a bishop; nor a ngle witness, though he be one of the faithful;" for the w saith, "in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall very word be established." Athanasius pleaded the privi-ge of this law, when he was accused for suffering Ma-arius, his presbyter, to break the communion-cup; he rged,[2] "that his accusers were Meletians, who ought ot to be credited, being schismatics, and enemies of the hurch." By the second council of Carthage,[3] not only eretics, but any others, that were known to be guilty of andalous crimes, were to be rejected from giving testi-ony against any elder of the Church. The first general-ouncil of Constantinople distinguishes the causes, upon hich an accusation might be brought against a bishop; r a man might have a private cause of complaint against im, as that he was defrauded in his property, or in any the ke case injured by him; in which case his accusation was be heard, without considering at all the quality of the erson or his religion. For a bishop was to keep a good onscience, and any man, that complained of being injured y him, was to have justice done him, whatever religion he as of. But if the crime was purely ecclesiastical, which as alleged against him, then the personal qualities of e accusers were to be examined; so that no heretics ould be allowed to accuse orthodox bishops in causes clesiastical;[4] nor any excommunicate persons, before they ad first made satisfaction for their own crimes; nor any, ho were impeached of crimes, of which they had not roved themselves innocent. The council of Chalcedon lds,[5] "that no clergyman or layman should be admitted impeach a bishop or a clerk, till his own reputation and aracter were first inquired into and fully examined." So

---

[1] Canon. Apost. c. 75. [2] Athan. Apol. ad Constant. tom. i. p. 731.
Con. Carth. ii. c. 6. Qui aliquibus sceleribus irretitus est, vocem adversus ajores natu non habeat accusandi. Vid. Cod. Can. Afric. c. 8.
Con. Constant. Gen. i. c. 6. [5] Con. Chalced. c. 21.

careful were they in this matter not to expose the credit of the clergy to the malicious designs or wicked conspiracies of any profligate wretches, whom malice or bribery might induce to accuse them. Thirdly, in case of false accusation, whether public or private, the penalty against the offender was very severe. "If any clergyman," says one of the Apostolical Canons,[1] "unjustly reproach a bishop, he shall be deposed; for it is written, "thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people." And by a canon of the council of Eliberis,[2] for any man to charge a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, with a false crime, which he could not make good against them, was excommunication without hopes of reconciliation at the hour of death. Which was the usual penalty, that was inflicted by that council upon very great and notorious offenders; for which some have censured the Spanish Church as guilty of Novatianism, but without reason, as I shall show, when I come to discourse of the discipline of the Church. Here it may be sufficient to observe, that they thought this crime one of the first magnitude, since they refused to give the external peace of the Church to such offenders, even at their last hour. Many other instances of the like respect might here be added, but by these few the reader will be able to judge, with what candour and civility the clergy of the primitive Church were obliged to receive and treat one another. And it would have been happy for all ages, had they walked in the same steps, and copied after so good an example.

---

[1] Canon. Apost. c. 47. [2] Con. Eliber. c. 75. Si quis Episcopum, Presbyterum, vel Diaconum falsis criminibus appetierit, et probare non potuerit, nec in fine dandam ei communionem.

CHAP. II.

Instances of Respect showed to the Clergy by the Civil Government. Particularly of their Exemption from the Cognizance of the Secular Courts in Ecclesiastical Causes.

SECT. I.—Bishops not to be called into any Secular Court to give their Testimony.

NEXT to the respect which the clergy showed to one another, it will be proper to speak of the honours which were done them by the civil magistrates, which were more or less, according as either the inclination and piety of the emperors led them, or as the state of the times required. These honours chiefly consisted in exempting them from some sort of obligations, to which others were liable, and in granting them certain privileges and immunities, which others did not enjoy. Of this kind was that instance of respect, which, by the laws of Justinian,[1] was granted to all bishops, "that no secular judge should compel them to appear in a public court to give their testimony before him, but he should send one of his officers to take it from their mouths in private." This law is also repeated in the Justinian Code,[2] and there said to be enacted first by Theodosius the Great, a law of whose is still extant in the same words, in the Theodosian Code.[3] But Gothofred will have it, that this law, as first enacted by Theodosius, meant no more than to exempt the clergy from being bound to give an account, to the civil magistrates, of what judgments or sentences they passed upon any secular causes, that were referred to their arbitration. And, indeed, it is evident, that the law-terms, "*ad testimonium devocari*," and "εἰς μαρτυρίαν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι," are taken in this sense by the Afri-

[1] Justin. Novel. 123. c. 7. Nulli judicum licebit Deo amabiles Episcopos cogere ad judicium venire pro exhibendo testimonio; sed judex mittat ad eos quosdam ex personis ministrantium sibi, &c. [2] Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 7. Imperator Theodosius dixit, Nec honore, nec legibus Episcopus ad testimonium dicendum flagitetur. [3] Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 39. de Fide Testium. leg. 8.

can fathers in the fifth council of Carthage, where it was agreed,[1] "to petition the emperors, to make a decree, that, if any persons referred a civil cause to the arbitration of the Church, and one of the parties chanced to be displeased with the decision or sentence, that was given against him, it should not be lawful to draw the clergyman, who was judge in the cause, into any secular court, to make him give any testimony or account of his determination." This was not intended to exempt clergymen in general from being called to be witnesses in a secular court, but only to free them from the prosecutions of vexatious and troublesome men, who, when they had chosen them for their arbitrators, would not stand to their arbitration, but prosecuted them in the civil courts, as if they had given a partial sentence against them. And though it was contrary to the law to give them any such trouble, because, as I have showed in another place,[2] all such determinations were to be absolutely decisive and final without appeal; yet it is probable some secular judges in Afric might give encouragement to such prosecutions; which made the African fathers complain of the grievance, and desire to have it redressed, in the forementioned canon, to which Gothofred thinks the law of Theodosius refers. But whether the law of Theodosius be thus to be limited, is a matter that may admit of further inquiry. Gothofred himself confesses that Justinian took it in a larger sense; and that is enough for me to found this privilege of bishops upon, that they were not to be called into a secular court, to give their testimony there in any case whatsoever.

SECT. 2.—Nor obliged to give their Testimony upon Oath, by the Laws of Justinian.

Another privilege of this kind, which also argued great respect paid to bishops, was, that when their testimony was

[1] Con. Carth. v. c. 1. It. Cod. Can. Afr. c. 59. Et Con. vulg. dict. Africanum. c. 26. Petendum ut statuere dignentur, ut si qui fortè in ecclesiâ quamlibet causam, jure apostolico ecclesiis imposito, agere voluerint, et fortassè decisio Clericorum uni parti displicuerit; non liceat Clericum in judicium ad testimonium devocari eum, qui cognitor vel præsens (forsan præses) fuerit. Et nulla ad testimonium dicendum Ecclesiastici cujuslibet persona pulsetur. [2] Book ii. chap. vii. sect. 3 and 4.

taken in private, they were not obliged to give it upon oath, as other witnesses were, but only upon their word, as became the priests of God, laying the Holy Gospels before them. For the same law of Justinian,[1] which grants them the former privilege, enacted this in their favour and behalf also. And in pursuance of that law probably the council of Tribur,[2] some ages after, decreed, "that no presbyter should be questioned upon oath, but instead of that only be interrogated upon his consecration, because it did not become a priest to swear upon a light cause." But it does not appear, that this indulgence was granted to bishops before the time of Justinian. For the council of Chalcedon[3] exacted an oath in a certain case of the Egyptian bishops; and the council of Tyre[4] required the same of Ibas, bishop of Edessa. And there are many other instances of the like nature.

SECT. 3.—Whether the single Evidence of one Bishop was good in Law against the Testimony of many others.

Constantine the Great granted many privileges to the clergy; but there are some that go under his name, which were certainly never granted by him. As his famed donation to the bishops of Rome, which Baronius[5] himself gives up for a forgery, and De Marca[6] and Pagi[7] prove it to be a spurious fiction of the ninth century, invented most probably by the same Isidore Mercator, who forged the Decretal Epistles of the ancient bishops of Rome. There are other privileges fathered upon Constantine, which, though not such manifest forgeries as the former, are yet by learned men reputed of a doubtful nature; such as that, which is comprised in a law under the name of Constantine[8] at the end of the Theodosian Code, where all judges are

---

[1] Justin. Novel. 123. c. 7. Propositis SS. Evangeliis, secundum quod decet Sacerdotes, dicant quod noverint, non tamen jurent. [2] Con. Tribur. c. 21. Presbyter vice juramenti per sanctam consecrationem interrogetur; quia Sacerdotes ex levi causâ jurare non debent, &c. [3] Con. Chalced. act. iv. tom. iv. p. 518. [4] Con. Tyr. in Act. ix. Con. Chalced. p. 629. [5] Baron. an. 324. n. 118. [6] Marca de Concord. lib. vi. c. 6. n. 6. [7] Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 324. n. 13. [8] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 12. de Episc. Audient. leg. 1. Testimonium etiam ab uno licet Episcopo perhibitum, omnes judices indubitanter accipiant, nec alius audiatur, cum testimonium Episcopi à quâlibet parte fuerit repromissum.

commanded to take the single evidence of one bishop, as good in law, againt all others whatsoever. Gothofred is of opinion, that this whole title in the Theodosian Code is spurious; and for this law in particular, there are two arguments that seem to prove it not genuine. First, because Constantine himself in another law says,[1] "the testimony of a single witness shall not be heard in any case, no, not though the witness be a senator." Secondly, because the ecclesiastical laws, as well as the civil, require two witnesses, as has been noted in the last chapter; which, I think, are sufficient arguments to prove, that no such extravagant privilege could be granted to bishops by Constantine; but I leave the reader to judge for himself, if he can find better arguments to the contrary.

SECT. 4.—Presbyters privileged against being questioned by Torture, as other Witnesses were.

We have better proof for another privilege, that we find granted to presbyters, which was, that, if any of them were called to give testimony in a public court, they should not be examined by scourging or torture, as the law directed in other cases. For by the Roman laws witnesses might be examined upon the rack, in some cases, to make them declare the whole truth; as we learn not only from the laws[2] themselves, but from St. Austin,[3] and Synesius,[4] who mention several new sorts of torture, which Andronicus, the tyrannical prefect of Ptolemais, invented beyond what the law directed. But now nothing of this kind could be imposed upon any presbyter of the Church; for they were exempted from it by a law of Theodosius the Great, which is still extant in both the Codes,[5] by which it also appears, that it was a peculiar privilege granted to bishops and presby-

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 39. de Fide Testium. leg. 3. Sancimus, ut unius omninò testis responsio non audiatur, etiamsi præclare curiæ honore præfulgeat.
[2] Vid. Cod. Justin. lib. ix. tit. 41. de Questionibus. It. Cod. Theodos. lib. xiii. tit. 9. de Naufragiis leg. 2.
[3] Aug. Serm. 49. de Divers. tom. x. p. 520.
[4] Synes. Ep. 58.
[5] Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 39. de Fide testium. leg. 10. Presbyteri citra injuriam quæstionis testimonium dicant; ita tamen ut falsa non simulent. Cæteri vero Clerici, qui eorum gradum vel ordinem subsequuntur, si ad testimonium dicendum petiti fuerint, prout leges præcipiunt, audiantur. Vid. Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 3. leg. 8.

ters, but to none below them: for the rest of the clergy are excepted, and left to the common way of examination, which in other cases the law directed to be used.

SECT. 5.—The Clergy exempt from the ordinary Cognizance of the Secular Courts in all Ecclesiastical Causes.

But the next privilege I am to mention, was a more universal one, that extended to all the clergy; which was their exemption from the ordinary cognizance of the secular courts in several sorts of causes. To understand this matter aright, we must carefully distinguish two things. First, the different kinds of causes, in which the clergy might be concerned; and secondly, the different powers of the inferior courts from that of the supreme magistrate, who was invested with a peculiar prerogative-power above them. The want of attending to which distinctions is the thing, that has bred so much confusion in modern authors upon this subject, and especially in the Romish writers, many of which are intolerably partial in their accounts, and highly injurious to the civil magistrates, under pretence of asserting and maintaining the rights and liberties of the Church. In the first place therefore, to have a right understanding in this matter, we must distinguish the several sorts of causes in which ecclesiastical persons might be concerned. Now these were of four kinds;—first, such as related to matters purely ecclesiastical, as crimes committed against the faith, or canons and discipline and good order of the Church, which were to be punished with ecclesiastical censures; secondly, such as related to mere civil and pecuniary matters between a clergyman and a layman; thirdly, such as related to political matters, as gross and scandalous crimes committed against the laws, and to the detriment of the commonwealth, as treason, rebellion, robbery, murder, and the like, which in the laws are called *Atrocia Delicta*; fourthly, such as related to lesser crimes of the same nature, which the law calls *Levia Delicta, small or petty offences.* Now, according to this distinction of causes, the clergy were, or were not exempt from the cognizance of the civil courts, by the laws of the Roman empire. In all matters, that were purely ecclesiastical, they were absolutely exempt,

as Gothofred,[1] the great civilian, scruples not to own. For all causes of that nature were reserved to the hearing of bishops and their councils, not only by the canons of the Church, but by the laws of the state also.

SECT. 6.—This evidenced from the Laws of Constantius.

This may be evidenced from the Rescripts of several emperors successively one after another, most of which are extant in both the Codes. Constantius, Anno 355, published a law,[2] wherein he prohibited any accusation to be brought against a bishop before a secular magistrate; but, if any one had any complaint against him, his cause should be heard and tried by a synod of bishops. This at least must signify in ecclesiastical causes; though Gothofred and some others say, it extended also to civil and criminal causes; and that though it looked like a privilege, yet it was intended as a snare to the Catholic bishops, to oppress them by his Arian synods, in those times, when the majority of bishops in any synod were commonly such as favoured the Arian party; and a Catholic bishop might expect more favour and justice from a secular court, than from them. But whether this law extended to all civil and criminal causes, is not very easy to determine:—thus much is certain, that, if it did, it was not long after in that part revoked, whilst in the other part it stood good, and was confirmed by the laws of the succeeding emperors.

SECT. 7.—And those of Valentinian and Gratian.

For Valentinian granted the clergy the same immunity in all ecclesiastical causes. As appears from what St. Ambrose writes to the younger Valentinian concerning his father, saying,[3] "Your father, of august memory, did not

---

[1] Gothofr. Comment. in Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 23. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 12. Mansuetudinis nostræ lege prohibemus in judiciis Episcopos accusari. - - - si quid est igitur querelarum, quod quispiam defert, apud alios potissimùm Episcopos convenit explorari, &c.

[3] Ambros. Ep. 32. Augustæ Memoriæ Pater tuus non solùm sermone respondit, sed etiam legibus suis sanxit, in causâ fidei, vel ecclesiastici alicujus ordinis eum judicare debere, qui nec munere impar, nec jure dissimilis. Hæc enim verba Rescripti sunt, Hoc est, Sacerdotes de Sacerdotibus voluit judicare.

only say it in words, but enacted it into a law, that in matters of faith and ecclesiastical order, they ought to judge, who were qualified by their office, and of the same order. For those are the words of his Rescript. That is, he would have priests to judge of priests." This law is not now extant in the Code, but there is another of Valentinian and Gratian to the same purpose; wherein it is decreed,[1] "that the same custom should be observed in ecclesiastical business, as was in civil causes. That if there arose any controversies about matters of religion, either from the dissentions of men, or other small offences, they should be heard and determined in the places, where they arose, or in the synod of the whole diocese. Except only such criminal actions, as were reserved to the hearing of the ordinary judges, the proconsuls and prefects of every province, or the extraordinary judges of the emperor's own appointing, or the illustrious powers," viz.—The *Præfectus-Prætorio* of the diocese. Here it is plain, that though criminal actions against the state-laws are excepted, yet all matters ecclesiastical were to be heard by ecclesiastical judges, and no other.

SECT. 8.—And Theodosius the Great.

In the last title of the Theodosian Code there is a law, under the name of Theodosius the Great, to the same purpose, wherein it is decreed,[2] "that no bishop, nor any other minister of the Church, shall be drawn into the civil courts of any ordinary or extraordinary judges, about matters or causes of an ecclesiastical nature, because they have judges of their own, and laws distinct from those of the state. This law is cited in Gratian's Decree, but the words, "*Quantum ad causas ecclesiasticas tamen pertinet*,"

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. Tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 23. Qui mos est causarum civilium, iidem in negotiis ecclesiasticis obtinendi sunt: ut siqua sunt ex quibusdam dissensionibus, levibusque delictis, ad religionis observantiam pertinentia, locis suis, et à suæ diœceseos synodis audiantur. . Exceptis quæ actio criminalis ab ordinariis extraordinariisque judicibus, aut inlustribus potestatibus audientia (leg. audienda) constituit. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 12. de Episc. Judicio. leg. 3. Continuâ lege sancimus, ut nullus Episcoporum vel eorum qui Ecclesiæ necessitatibus serviunt. ad judicia sive ordinariorum sive extraordinariorum judicum (quantum tamen ad causas ecclesiasticas pertinet) pertrahatur, &c.

are there[1] fraudulently left out, to serve the current doctrine and hypothesis of his own times, and make the reader believe, that the clergy anciently enjoyed an exemption not only in ecclesiastical causes, but all others. I the rather mention this corruption, because none of the correctors of Gratian have taken any notice of it. The Roman censors silently pass it over, and it has escaped the diligence of Antonius Augustinus and Baluzius also. Gothofred indeed questions the authority of the law itself; but I shall not stand to dispute that, since there is nothing in it contrary to the preceding laws, or those that followed after.

SECT. 9.—And Arcadius and Honorius.

For Arcadius and Honorius continued the same privilege to the clergy, confirming the ancient laws,[2] "that whenever any cause relating to religion was debated, the bishops were to be judges; but other causes, belonging to the cognizance of the ordinary judges, and the use of the common laws, were to be heard by them only."

SECT. 10.—And Valentinian the Third, and Justinian.

Theodosius Junior and Valentinian the Third refer to this law of Honorius, as the standing law then in force, concerning the immunities and liberties of the clergy, saying in one of their decrees,[3] "that bishops and presbyters had no court of secular laws, nor any power to judge of other causes, except such as related to religion, according to the Constitutions of Arcadius and Honorius inserted into the Theodosian Code." So that all the same laws, which denied them power in secular causes, allowed them the privilege of judging in ecclesiastical causes; and the very excepting of other causes is a manifest proof, that there was no contest made about these to the time of Jus-

[1] Gratian Caus. xi. Quæst. 1. c. 5. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 11. de Religione, leg. 1. Quoties de religione agitur, Episcopos convenit judicare: cæteras verò causas, quæ ad ordinarios cognitores, vel ad usum publici juris pertinent, legibus oportet audiri. [3] Valentin. Novel. 12. ad Calc. Cod. Theod. Constat Episcopos et Presbyteros forum legibus non habere: nec de aliis causis, secundum Arcadii et Honorii divalia constituta, quæ Theodosianum Corpus ostendit, præter religionem posse cognoscere.

tinian, who confirmed the privilege, which so many of his predecessors had granted before him. For in one of his Novels we find it enacted,[1] "that all ecclesiastical crimes, which were to be punished with ecclesiastical penalties and censures, should be judged by the bishop; the provincial judges not intermedling with them. "For," saith he, "it is our pleasure, that such matters shall not be heard by the civil judges."

SECT. 11.—The Clergy also exempt in lesser Criminal Causes.

Gothofred is also of opinion,[2] that some of the lesser criminal causes of ecclesiastics were to be determined by the bishops and their synods likewise. For in the forementioned law of Gratian (see before sect. 7.) the *Levia Delicta,* or *lesser crimes* are reserved to the hearing of bishops. And St. Ambrose, having spoken of the decree of Valentinian, which orders all ecclesiastical causes to be judged by bishops only, adds also,[3] "that, if in other respects a bishop was to be censured, and his morals came under examination, such causes as those likewise should appertain to the episcopal judgment." Which seems to put some distinction between ecclesiastical and civil criminal causes, and reserves both to the hearing of bishops and their synods. But then, as Gothofred rightly observes, this must only be understood of lesser criminal causes; for in greater criminal actions the clergy were liable to the cognizance of the secular judges, as well as all others. Which is freely owned by De Marca, and some other ingenuous writers of the Romish Church. For De Marca[4] quits the positions of

[1] Justin. Novel. 83. Si verò ecclesiasticum sit delictum, egens castigatione ecclesiasticâ et multâ, Deo amabilis Episcopus hoc discernat, nihil communicantibus clarissimis provinciæ judicibus. Neque enim volumus talia negotia omninò scire civiles judices. [2] Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. Leg. 23. [3] Ambr. Ep. 32. Quinetiam si alias quoque argueretur Episcopus, et morum esset examinanda causa, etiam hanc voluit ad episcopale judicium pertinere.

[4] Marca dissert. in Cap. Clericus ad Calcem Antonii Augustini de Emendat Gratiani, p. 577. In Codice Theodosiano controversiæ, quæ ad religionem pertinent, in quibus sunt crimina Ecclesiastica, et minora delicta è civilium numero, Episcopis et cujusque diœceseos sive provinciæ Synodis relinquuntur: servatâ judiciis publicis atrocium criminum, quæ numero quinque, adversus Clericos cognitione; ut docent leges aliquot editæ curâ Sirmondi in Appendice Codicis Theodosiani.

Baronius and the canonists, and confesses, "that, as it appears from the Theodosian Code, that the ecclesiastical crimes, and lesser civil crimes of the clergy were left to the hearing of bishops, and the synods of every diocese or province; so the greater civil crimes of the clergy, which he reckons five in number, were reserved to the hearing of the public courts and civil judges, which, he says,[1] "appears from the laws published by Sirmondus, in his appendix to the Theodosian Code."

SECT. 12.—But not in greater Criminal Causes.

Some reckon those laws to be of no very great authority, and therefore I shall rather choose to confirm this position from the undoubted laws, which occur in the body of the Theodosian Code. Such as that of Theodosius and Gratian,[2] which particularly excepts these greater criminal actions, and reserves them to the hearing of the ordinary or extraordinary judges, or the *Præfectus-Prætorio* of the diocese; and those other laws of Theodosius, and Arcadius, and Honorius, and Valentinian the Third, which have been cited in the foregoing sections,[3] and need not here be repeated. To which we may add that law of the elder Valentinian, which orders[4] "all such ecclesiastics to be prosecuted in the civil courts, that were found guilty of creeping into the houses of widows, and orphans, and so insinuating into their affections, as to prevail upon them to disinherit their relations, and make them their heirs." And that other law of the emperor Marcian, which, in criminal causes, exempts the clergy of Constantinople[5] "from the

[1] See Barthol. Milletot. de Legitimâ Judicum Secularium Potestate in Personas Ecclesiasticas. Franc. 1613. p. 774. Liber prohib. ap. Soto-Major. Bernard. Laurentius. Casus, quibus judex secularis potest manus injicere in Personas Ecclesiasticas, item de Privilegiis Clericorum. Par. 1517. octav. Ven. 1584. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 23. Exceptis quæ actio criminalis ab ordinariis extraordinariisque judicibus, aut illustribus potestatibus audienda constituit. [3] See sect. 8, 9, 10. [4] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. leg. 20. Ecclesiastici - - - Viduarum ac pupillarum domos non adeant: sed publicis exterminentur judiciis, si posthâc eos affines earum vel propinqui putaverint deferendos. [5] Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 35. Actor in nullo alio foro, vel apud quenquam alterum judicem eosdem Clericos litibus irretire, et civilibus vel criminalibus negotiis tentet innectere.

cognizance of all inferior courts, but not from the high court of the *Præfectus-Prætorio* of the royal city." Which appears also to have been the practice at Rome. For Socrates observes,[1] that, when in the conflict, which happened at the election of Pope Damasus, some persons were slain, many both of the laity and clergy upon that account were punished by Maximinus, who was then *Præfectus-Prætorio* at Rome. It appears further from the Novels of Valentinian the Third,[2] that in such criminal actions as those of murder, robbing of graves, or the like, bishops, as well as any other clerks, were bound to answer before the civil magistrate by their proctors. But Justinian a little enlarged the privilege with respect to bishops, making a decree,[3] "that no one should draw a bishop in any pecuniary or criminal cause before a secular magistrate, against his will, unless the emperor gave particular order to do it." This was the plain state of the matter, as to what concerned the exemption of the clergy, in this sort of criminal causes, notwithstanding what Baronius, or any others of that strain have said to the contrary. Nay, some ages after, such crimes as murder, theft, and witchcraft, were brought before the secular judges in France, as appears from the council of Mascon,[4] Anno 581.

Sect. 13.—Nor in Pecuniary Causes with Laymen.

The case was much the same in all civil pecuniary controversies, which the clergy had with laymen. For though they might end all such causes, which they had one with another, in their own courts, or before a synod of bishops; and the canons obliged them so to do, as has been noted in the last chapter;[5] yet, if their controversy happened to be with a layman, the layman was not bound to refer the

---

[1] Socrat. lib. iv, c. 29. *Διὰ τοῦτο πολλοὺς λαϊκοὺς τε καὶ κληρικοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ τότε ἐπάρχου Μαξιμίνου τιμωρηθῆναι.* [2] Valent. Novel. 5. de Sepulcr. Violat. ad Calcem Cod. Theod. It. Novel. 12. Quam formam etiam circa Episcoporum personam observari oportere censemus, ut si in hujusmodi ordinis homines actionem pervasionis et atrocium injuriarum dirigi necesse fuerit, per procuratorem solemniter ordinatum, apud judicem publicum inter leges et jura confligant. [3] Justin. Novel. 123. n. 8. Sed neque ut Episcopus pro pecuniariâ aliquâ aut criminali causâ ad civilem militaremve magistratum invitus perducatur, sistaturve sine imperiali jussione concedimus. [4] Con. Matiscon. 1. Can. 7. [5] Chap. i. sect. 4.

hearing of his cause to an ecclesiastical court, unless he had voluntarily consented by way of compromise to take some ecclesiastical persons for his arbitrators. This is evident from one of the Constitutions of Valentinian the Third, which says,[1] "that if the plaintiff was a layman, he might compel any clergyman, with whom he had a civil contest, to answer in a civil court, if he rather chose it." And the council of Epone,[2] according to the reading of Sirmond's edition, says the same, "that the clergy, if they were sued in a secular court, should make no scruple to follow the plaintiff thither." But Justinian,[3] at the instance of Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, granted the clergy of the royal city a peculiar privilege, "that in all pecuniary matters their cause should first be brought before the bishop; and if the nature of the cause happened to be such, that he could not determine it, then recourse might be had to the civil judges, but not otherwise." From all which it appears, that anciently exemptions of this nature were not challenged as matters of divine right, but depended wholly upon the will and pleasure of Christian princes, however after-ages came to put another kind of gloss upon them.

SECT. 14.—Of the necessary Distinction between the Supreme and Subordinate Magistrates in this Business of Exemptions.

Nay it must be observed, that even in ecclesiastical causes, a great difference was always observed between the power of the prince or supreme magistrate, and that of the subordinate and inferior judges. For though the ordinary judges were bound by the laws not to intermeddle with ecclesiastical causes; yet in some cases the prince himself interposed and appointed extraordinary judges, and sometimes heard and decided the causes himself, or reversed the decisions of ecclesiastics by his sovereign power, which no ordinary judges were qualified to do. But this belongs to

[1] Valent. Novel. 12. Petitor Laicus, seu in civili seu in criminali causâ, cujuslibet loci Clericum adversarium suum, si id magis eligat, per auctoritatem legitimam in publico judicio respondere compellat. [2] Con. Epaunens. c. 11. Si pulsati fuerint, sequi ad seculare judicium non morentur. Yet note, that other editions, as that of Crab and Binius, read it to a contrary sense. Sequi ad seculare judicium non præsumant. [3] Justin. Novel. 83.

another subject, that will have a more proper place in this work, when we come to speak of the power of Christian princes.

CHAP. III.

Of the Immunities of the Clergy in reference to Taxes and Civil Offices and other burdensome Employments in the Roman Empire.

SECT 1.—No divine Right pleaded by the ancient Clergy to exempt themselves from Taxes.

ANOTHER privilege, which the clergy enjoyed by the favour of Christian princes, was, that in some certain cases, according to the exigency of times and places, they were exempt from some of the taxes, that were laid upon the rest of the Roman empire. But whatever they enjoyed of this kind, they did not pretend to as matter of divine right, but freely acknowledged it to be owing to the pious munificence and favour of Christian emperors. Therefore Baronius[1] does them great injustice, and is guilty of very gross prevarication, in pretending, that they claimed a freedom from tribute by the law of Christ; and that no emperor ever imposed any tax upon them, except only Julian, the apostate, and Valens, the Arian, and the younger Valentinian, who was wholly governed by his mother Justina, an Arian empress; that, when St. Ambrose paid tribute under this Valentinian, he did it only out of his Christian meekness, not that he was otherwise under any obligation to have done it. How true this representation is, the reader may judge in part from the words of St. Ambrose, which are these,[2] "if the emperor demands tribute of us, we do not deny it: the lands of the Church pay tribute. We pay to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's. Tribute is Cæsar's, and therefore we do not refuse

[1] Baron. an. 387. tom. iv. p. 538. [2] Ambr. Orat. cont. Auxent. de Tradend. Basilic. post Ep. 32. Si tributum petit Imperator, non negamus; agri Ecclesiæ solvunt tributum. - - - - Solvimus, quæ sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari, et quæ sunt Dei, Deo. Tributum Cæsaris est, non negatur.

to pay it." This is so far from challenging any exemption by divine right, that it plainly asserts the contrary. As in another place he argues, that all men are under an obligation to pay tribute,[1] because the Son of God himself paid it, Matt. xvii. 23. And yet Baronius cites[2] that very passage of the evangelist to prove that the clergy are *jure divino* exempt, because our Saviour says, "then are the children free." "For if," says he, "the children be free; much more so are the fathers, that is, the pastors, under whose care princes are." Bellarmin is much more ingenuous in handling this question; for he asserts,[3] against the Canonists, whose opinion Baronius labours to maintain, "that the exemption of the clergy in political matters, whether relating to their persons, or their goods, was introduced by human right only, and not divine; and that in fact they were never exempted from any other but personal tribute, till the time of Justinian, when they were freed from taxes upon their estates and possessions also." So little agreement is there betwixt these two great cardinals of the Romish Church in their accounts of this matter, either as to fact or right, that in every thing their assertions are point blank contrary to one another.

SECT. 2.—Yet generally excused from Personal Taxes, or Head-money.

To set the matter in a clear light, it will be necessary for me to give the reader a distinct account of the several sorts of tribute, that were imposed upon subjects in the Roman empire, and to show, how far the clergy were concerned in each of them; which will be best done by having recourse to the Theodosian Code, where most of the laws relating to this affair are still extant. And this I shall the rather do, because Baronius makes use of the same authority, but with great partiality, dissembling every thing that would not serve the hypothesis, he had undertaken to maintain.

---

[1] Ambr. lib. iv. in Luc. 5. et ap. Gratian. caus. 11. Q. i. c. 28. Si census Filius Dei solvit, quis tu tantus es, qui non putes esse solvendum?

[2] Baron. an. 387. p. 588.

[3] Bellarm. de Clericis lib. i. c. 28. Exceptio Clericorum in rebus politicis, tam quoad personas, quam quoad bona, jure humano introducta est, non divino. Hæc propositio est contra Canonistas.

Now the first sort of tribute, I shall take notice of, is that, which is commonly called *Census Capitum*, or *personal tribute*, to distinguish it from the *Census Agrorum*, or *tribute arising from men's estates and possessions*. That the clergy were generally freed from this sort of tribute is agreed on all hands; only Gothofred has a very singular notion about it. For he asserts,[1] "that under the Christian emperors there was no such tribute as this paid by any men; so that the exemption of the clergy in this case was no peculiar privilege belonging to them, but only what they enjoyed in common with all other subjects of the Roman empire." But in this that learned man seems evidently to be mistaken. For first, he owns, there was such a tribute under the heathen emperors, from which, as Ulpian relates,[2] none were excused, save only minors under fourteen, and persons superannuated, that is, above sixty-five; nor does he produce any law to show, when or by whom that tribute was ordered to be laid aside. Secondly, Theodosius Junior, the author of the Theodosian Code, makes express mention of it, when in one of his novels[3] he distinguishes betwixt the *Census Capitum*, and *Census Agrorum*. Thirdly, there are several laws in the Theodosian Code, exempting the clergy from tribute, which cannot fairly be understood of any other tribute but this sort of capitation. As when Constantius grants the clergy the same immunity from tribute, as minors had, he plainly refers to the old law about minors, mentioned by Ulpian, and puts the clergy upon the same foot with them, granting them this privilege,[4] "that not only they themselves, but their wives and children, their men-servants, and their maid-servants, should all be free from tribute;" meaning personal tribute, or that sort of capitation called *Capitis Census*. After the same man-

[1] Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 1. de Annon. et Tribut. leg. 15. It Com. in lib. xiii. tit. 10. de Censu. leg. 4. [2] Digest. lib. 50. tit. 15. de Censibus leg. iii. Quibusdam ætas tribuit, ne tributo onerentur. Veluti in Syriis à quatuordecim annis masculi, à duodecim fœminæ usque ad sexagesimum quintum annum tributo capitis onerentur. [3] Theodos. Novel. 21. [4] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. 10 et 14. Clericis ac juvenibus præbeatur immunitas. - - - Quod et conjugibus et liberis eorum et ministeriis majoribus pariter ac fœminis indulgemus; quos à censibus etiam jubemus perseverare immunes.

ner we are to understand those two laws of Valentinian,[1] where he grants to devoted virgins, and widows, and orphans under twenty years of age, the same immunity from tribute, or as it is there called,—the capitation of the vulgar. As also that other law of his,[2] where he grants the like privilege to painters, together with their wives and children. From all which we may very reasonably conclude, that this exemption from personal taxes was not a thing then common to all, but a peculiar privilege of some certain arts and professions, among which the most honourable was that of the clergy.

This may be further confirmed from an observation or two out of Gregory Nazianzen and Basil. Nazianzen, in one of his Epistles to Amphilochius,[3] complains, "that the officers of the government had made an illegal attempt upon one Euthalius, a deacon, to oblige him to pay taxes;" therefore he desires Amphilochius[4] "not to permit this injury to be done him; since otherwise he would suffer an hardship above other men, not being allowed to enjoy the favour of the times, and the honour, which the emperors had granted to the clergy." Here he plainly refers to some immunity from tribute, which the imperial laws granted particularly to the clergy; which could not be any exemption of their estates from tribute, for there was no such law then in force to be appealed to. It must therefore mean their exemption from personal taxes, from which they were freed by the laws of Valentinian and Constantius already mentioned. This will still receive greater light and confirmation from the testimony of St. Basil, who had occasion to

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xiii. tit. 10. de Censu leg. 4. In virginitate perpetuâ viventes, et eam viduam de quâ ipsa maturitas pollicetur ætatis nulli jam eam esse nupturam, à plebeiæ capitationis injuriâ vindicandas esse decernimus: item pupillos in virili sexu usque ad viginti annos ab istiusmodi functione immunes esse debere; mulieres autem donec virum unaquæque sortitur. Ibid. leg. 6. Nulla vidua, nemo pupillus, exactionem plebis agnoscat, &c. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xiii. tit. 4, de Excusat. Artific. leg. 4. Picturæ professores, si modo ingenui sunt, placuit, neque sui capitis centione, neque uxorum, aut etiam liberorum nomine, tributis esse munificos. [3] Naz. Ep. 159. Διαγράφειν ἐπιχειρῶσι χρυσὸν ὁι τῆς ἡγεμονικῆς τάξεως. [4] Ibid. Δεινότατα ἂν πάθοι, μόνος ἀνθρώπων μὴ τυγχάνων τῆς τῶν καιρῶν φιλανθρωπίας, ἢ τῆς διδομένης τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων τιμῆς.

make a like complaint to Modestus, who was *Præfectus-Prætorio Orientis* under Valens, of some who had infringed the privilege of the clergy in exacting tribute of them against the laws. "The ancient way of taxing,"[1] says he, "excused such, as were consecrated to God, presbyters and deacons, from paying tribute; but now they, who are set over this affair, pretending to have no warrant from your eminency to excuse them, have taxed them all, except such as could claim a privilege from their age." Therefore his request to him was, "*Συγχωρηθῆναι κατὰ τὸν παλαιὸν νόμον τῆς συντελείας τὸς ἱερατεύονται,—that the clergy might be exempt from tribute according to the ancient laws.*" St. Basil in this passage refers to two sorts of laws exempting persons from tribute; the one, those ancient laws of the heathen emperors, which only excused minors and superannuates from personal tribute; the other, those laws of Constantius and Valentinian, which exempted the clergy also, granting them that immunity, which only minors enjoyed before. And this is the thing he complains of, that the clergy were not allowed the benefit of the Christian laws, but only those laws of the heathen emperors, whereby, if they chanced to be minors or superannuated, that is, under twenty or above sixty-five, they were excused, but not otherwise. From all which it evidently appears, that the clergy might claim a peculiar privilege by the laws to be exempted from personal tribute, and that this was not common to all the subjects of the empire, whatever Gothofred, and Pagi from him have suggested to the contrary.[2]

SECT. 3.—But not excused for their Lands and Possessions.

The next sort of tribute was that, which was exacted of men for their lands and possessions, which goes by several names in the civil law and ancient writers. Sometimes it is called *Κανὼν*, as by Athanasius,[3] where he complains

[1] Basil Ep. 279. ad Modest. *Τὸς τῷ Θεῷ ἱερωμένους, πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους ὁ παλαιὸς κῆνσος ἀτελεῖς ἀφῆκεν. Οἱ δὲ νῦν ἀπογράψάμενοι, ὡς ἐ λαβόντες παρὰ τῆς ὑπερφυοῦς σε ἐξουσίας πρόσταγμα, ἀπεγράψαντο, πλὴν εἰ μή τε τινὲς ἄλλως ἔιχον ὑπὸ τῆς ἡλικίας τὴν ἄφεσιν.* [2] Pagi. Crit. in Baron. an. 353. n. 10. [3] Athan. Apol. ii. p. 778. *Ὡς ἐμὸ κανόνα τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἐπιβάλλοντος*, &c.

how he was unjustly accused of imposing a tax upon Egypt for the use of the Church of Alexandria. So in the Theodosian Code there is a whole title,[1] *De Canone Frumentario Urbis Romæ*, which signifies the tribute of corn, that was exacted of the African provinces for the use of the city of Rome. It is otherwise called *Jugatio* from *Juga*, which, as Gothofred notes,[2] signifies "as much land as a yoke of oxen could plough in a year;" and, because the taxation was made according to that rate, it had therefore the name of *Jugatio* and *Juga*. It has also frequently the name of *Capitatio* and *Capita;* and because men's servants and cattle were reckoned into their taxable possessions as well as their lands, therefore in some laws[3] the one is called *Capitatio Terrena*, and the other *Capitatio Humana* and *Animalium*, or *Animarum Descriptio*. These taxes were usually paid three times a year, once every four months; whence Sidonius Apollinaris[4] styles them *Tria Capita*, or *the monster with three heads*, which he desired the emperor Majorianus to free him from, that he might live and subsist the better; for thus he addresses himself to him in his poetical way:

Geryones nos esse puta, monstrumque tributum;
Hic capita, ut vivam, tu mihi tolle tria.

In which words, which none of the commentators rightly understood, he refers to a law of Valentinian's,[5] and several others in the Theodosian Code; where this sort of tribute is required to be paid by three certain portions in a year, or once in four months, which, in his phrase, is the *Tria Capita*, or *monster with three heads*. The collectors of this tax were also hence called *Cephaleotæ*, *collectors of the capitation*, in some laws of the Theodosian Code:[6] and be-

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xiv. tit. 15. Cod. Theod. lib. ii. tit. 9. de Distrahendis Pignoribus. leg. 1. Vestes canonicæ, et equi canonici. [2] Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Theod. lib. xiii. tit. 10. de Censu, leg. ii. p. 118. Ego juga putem dicta terræ modum, cui colendo per annum jugo boum opus est.
[3] Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 20. de Conlat. Donat. leg. vi. [4] Sidon. Carm. xiii. ad Majorian. [5] Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 1. de Annon. et Tribut. leg. 15. Unusquisque annonarias species, pro modo capitationis et sortium, prœbiturus, per quaternos menses anni curriculo distributo, tribus vicibus summam conlationis implebit. [6] Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 24. de Patrocin. Vicor. leg. 5.

cause this tribute was commonly paid in specie, as in corn, wine, oil, iron, brass, &c. for the emperor's service; therefore it is often called *Specierum Collatio;* and being the ordinary standing tax of the empire, it is no less frequently styled *Indictio Canonica,*[1] in opposition to the *Superindicta et extraordinaria,* that is, such taxes as were levied upon *extraordinary occasions.* I have noted these things here all together, that I may not be put to explain the terms at every turn hereafter, as I have occasion to make use of them, which are indeed a little uncommon, and not easily understood, but by such as are conversant in the civil law.

Now to the question in hand,—whether the clergy in general were exempt from this ordinary canonical tribute laid upon men's goods and possessions? I answer in the negative against Baronius, who asserts the contrary. Some particular Churches, indeed, had special favours granted them by indulgent princes, to exempt them from all tribute of this kind; but those very exceptions prove, that what was matter of grace to some particular Churches, could not be the common privilege of all Churches. Theodosius Junior[2] granted a special exemption to the Church of Thessalonica, "that she should pay no capitation for her own estate, provided she did not take other lands into her protection, to the detriment of the commonwealth, under the pretence of an ecclesiastical title." He also allowed the Churches of Constantinople and Alexandria the same privilege, upon the like condition,[3] "that they should not take any villages, great or small, into their patronage, to excuse them from paying their ancient capitation." Gothofred is also of opinion, that, in the beginning of Constantine's reign, while the Church was poor, and her standing revenues but

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. vi. tit. 26. de Proximis Comitib. &c. leg. 14. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 1. de Annon. et Tribut. leg. 33. Sacrosanctâ Thessalonicensis ecclesiâ civitatis exceptâ: ita tamen ut apertè sciat, propriæ tantummodò capitationis modum beneficio mei numinis sublevandum: nec externorum gravamine tributorum Rempublicam ecclesiastici nominis abusione lædendam. [3] Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 24. de Patrocin. Vicor. leg. 5. Quicquid ecclesiæ venerabiles, (id est, Constantinopolitana et Alexandrina) possedisse deteguntur, id prointuitu religionis ab his præcipimus firmiter retineri: sub eâ videlicet sorte, ut in futurum functiones omnes quæ metrocomiæ debent, et publici vici pro antiquæ capitationis professione debent, sciant subeundas.

small, her estates and possessions were universally excused from tribute; for there is a law in the Theodosian Code,[1] which may be interpreted to this purpose; though the words are so obscure, that, without the help of so wise an interpreter, one would hardly find out the sense of them. However, admitting them to signify such a privilege, it is certain it lasted not many years; for in the next reign under Constantius, when the Church was grown pretty wealthy, all the clergy, that were possessed of lands, were obliged to pay tribute, in the same manner as all others did; as appears from a law of Constantius, directed to *Taurus, Præfectus-Prætorio,* which is still extant in both the Codes.[2] This is further evident from the testimony of Valentinian, who, in an epistle to the bishops of Asia, recorded by Theodoret,[3] says, "all good bishops thought themselves obliged to pay tribute, and did not resist the imperial power." And thus matters continued to the time of Honorius and Theodosius Junior,[4] in one of whose laws the Church-lands are still made liable to this ordinary or canonical tribute, as it is there worded, though excused from all other. So little reason had Baronius to assert with that confidence, "that no prince, except Julian, the apostate, and Valens, the Arian, and the younger Valentinian, who was under the conduct of an Arian woman, ever exacted any tribute of the clergy;" when, as it appears, every emperor after Constantine did exact it; and Baronius could not be ignorant of this, having viewed and perused the Theodosian Code, where these things are recorded.

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 1. de Annon. et Tribut. leg. 1. Præter privatas res nostras, et ecclesias Catholicas, et domum clarissimæ memoriæ Eusebii ex-consule, et Arsacis regis Armeniorum, nemo ex nostrâ jussione præcipuis emolumentis, familiaris juvetur substantiæ. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. 15. De his sanè Clericis qui prædia possident, sublimis auctoritas tua non solum eos aliena juga nequaquam statuet excusare, sed etiam his quæ ipsi possident eosdem ad pensitanda fiscalia perurgeri: universos namque Clericos possessores duntaxàt provinciales pensitationes recognoscere jubemus. Vid. Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 3. leg. 3. [3] Theod. lib. iv. c. 8. Τὰ δημόσια κατὰ νόμους εἰσκομίζειν ἴσασι, καὶ οὐκ ἀντιλέγουσι τῇ τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἐξουσίᾳ. [4] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. 40. Nihil præter canonicam inlationem - - - ejus functionibus adscribatur.

SECT. 4.—*Of the Tribute called, Aurum Tironicum, Equi Canonici, &c.*

If in any thing of this tribute they were exempt, it must be from the obligation some provinces lay under to furnish the emperors with new soldiers, called *Tirones*, and fresh horses for the wars; which, because they were exhibited by way of tribute, are called in the law, *Equi Canonici*, from the civil-law term *Canon*, and *Canonica*, which, as I observed before, signifies the tribute, that was laid upon men's lands and possessions. Sometimes this tribute was exacted in money instead of horses, and then it was called[1] *Equorum Canonicorum Adæratio, horse-money.* In like manner as the sum, that was paid instead of the *Tirones*, was called *Aurum Tironicum*, and *Stratioticum, soldier's money*, which we find mentioned in Synesius,[2] where, speaking of Andronicus, governor of Ptolemais, he says, "He set one Thoas to collect this *Aurum Tironicum*;" which, the editor by mistake says, was so called, "*quia solvebatur Tironibus, because it was paid to the Tirones*;" whereas, indeed, it was the money that was paid instead of the *Tirones*, by way of tribute, into the treasury of the empire. Now, that some bishops, at least in Afric, were excused from this tribute, is concluded by some learned men from a law of Theodosius Junior,[3] which excuses certain persons from it, under the title of *Sacerdotales*, in the proconsular Afric, and that, because they were otherwise obliged to be at great expenses in that province. But now the question is,—who are meant by the name, *Sacerdotales?* The learned Petit says,[4] it denotes Christian bishops; and if so, the case would be clear as to their exemption. But Gothofred[5] rather inclines to think it means the high priests

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 17. de Equor. Conlat. leg. 3. Equos Canonicos militaris diœceseos Africanæ - - - jussimus adærari, &c. [2] Synes. Ep. 79. ad Anastas. p. 293. Ταῖς ἀπαιτήσεσιν ἴταξε τῷ στρατιωτικῷ χρυσίῳ τῷ καλουμένῳ τιρωνικῷ. [3] Cod. Th. lib. vii. tit. 13. de Tiron. leg. 22. Præcipimus Proconsularis Provinciæ non eandem Sacerdotalium, quæ est de cæteris, in præbendis Tironibus habendam esse rationem: non iniquè siquidem ea potissimum ab hoc officio provincia videtur excepta, quæ omnium intra Africam provinciarum obtinet principatum, cujusque majoribus fatigantur expensis. [4] Petit Variar. Lection. lib. iii. c. 1. p. 26. [5] Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Th. 7, 13, 22.

among the heathens, who were still in being, and obliged by their office to be at great expenses in exhibiting the *Ludi Sacerdotales* to the people. I will not venture to decide so nice a dispute betwixt two such learned men, but think, however, I may safely infer even from Gothofred's notion,—that, if the Christian emperors were so liberal to the heathen high priests, they would at least be as liberal to their own bishops, and grant them the same immunity. But I leave this matter to further inquiry.

SECT. 5.—The Church obliged to such Burthens as Lands were tied to before their Donation.

One thing is more certain, that whatever burthens any lands were originally encumbered with, they were liable to the same even after their donation to the Church, unless discharged of them by some particular grant and favour of the emperors. This we learn from a memorable instance in a particular case, wherein St. Austin was concerned, the account of which we have from his own relation. For the right understanding of which I must first acquaint the reader, that by the laws of the Roman polity many times a company of tradesmen were so incorporated into a society, for the service of the empire, that their estates were tied to that office and duty, so that, whoever had the propriety of them, he was bound to the duty annexed to them. Thus it was particularly with the incorporated company of the *Navicularii* of Afric and Egypt, who were concerned in transporting the yearly tribute of corn from those provinces to Rome and Constantinople. Their estates were tied to the performance of this service, as appears from a title in the Theodosian Code,[1] which is *De Prædiis Naviculariorum*. And they were so tied, that if any ship chanced to be lost in the passage, the whole body was obliged to make good the effects to the emperor's coffers;[2] and the master of the ship was obliged to give up his men, that escaped the shipwreck, to be examined by torture after-

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xiii. tit. 6. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xiii. tit. 9. de Naufrag. leg. 2. Si quando causatio est de impetu procellarum, medium ex his nautis numerum navicularius exhibeat quæstioni - - - Quo eorum tormentis plenior veritas possit inquiri.

wards; otherwise he must have borne the whole burthen himself alone, on presumption that he was guilty of some fraud in the matter against the rest of his society. Now it happened while St. Austin was bishop of Hippo, that one of these *Navicularii*, Boniface, a master of a ship, left his whole estate to the Church; which yet St. Austin refused to receive, because of these burthens that lay upon it. "For," says he,[1] "I was not willing to have the Church of Christ concerned in the business of transportation. It is true indeed, there are many, who get estates by shipping; yet there is one temptation in it,—if a ship should chance to go and be lost, then we should be required to give up our men to the rack, to be examined by torture according to law, about the drowning of the ship, and the poor wretches, that had escaped the waves, must undergo a new severity from the hands of the judge. But we could not thus deliver them up; for it would not become the Church so to do. Therefore she must answer the whole debt to the exchequer. But whence should she do this? for our circumstances do not allow us to keep a treasury. A bishop ought not to lay up gold in bank, and meanwhile refuse to relieve the poor." These words of St. Austin do plainly evince what has been observed, that the donation of an estate to the Church did not ordinarily free it from the tribute or duty, that the public otherwise demanded of it; but if the Church would receive it, she must take it with the usual burthens that lay upon it. I confess indeed the sense of the passage, as it lies in St. Austin without a comment, is not very easy to be understood; nor have any of his editors, no, not the last Benedictins, thought fit to expound it; but for that reason, as well as to make good my own observation, I have recited it in this place, and ex-

---

[1] Aug. Serm. 49. de Diversis. tom. x. p. 520. Bonifacii hæreditatem suscipere nolui; non misericordiâ, sed timore. Navicularium nolui esse Ecclesiam Christi. Multi sunt quidem qui etiam de navibus acquirunt: tamen una tentatio est, si iret navis et naufragaret, homines ad tormenta daturi eramus, et de submersione navis secundùm consuetudinem quærerentur: et torquerentur à judice qui essent à fluctibus liberati: sed non eos daremus: nullo enim pacto hoc facere deceret Ecclesiam. Onus ergo fiscale persolveret. Sed unde persolveret? En! thecam nobis habere non licet, &c.

plained it from those laws and customs of the empire, to which it manifestly refers. And such a digression, if it were a digression, I presume would not be unacceptable to the curious reader.

SECT. 6.—Of the *Chrysargyrum*, or *Lustral Tax*, and the Exemption of the Clergy from it.

But now to proceed. Another sort of tribute, in which the clergy had some concern, was the tax upon trade and commerce. This in ancient writers[1] is known by the name of Χρυσάργυρον, *Chrysargyrum, the silver and gold-tax*, because it was paid in those coins. Zosimus[2] indeed makes the *Chrysargyrum* another thing, viz. a scandalous tax exacted of lewd men and women; and in his spite to Christianity he represents Constantine as the author of it: in which his groundless calumny he is abundantly refuted by Baronius,[3] and more especially by the learned Gothofred,[4] and Pagi, whom the curious reader may consult. Here I take the *Chrysargyrum* in the common notion, only for the tax upon lawful trade and commerce, which St. Basil calls[5] Πραγματευτικὸν χρυσίον, *commerce-money*. In the civil law it is known by the name of *Lustralis Collatio, the lustral tax*, because it was exacted at the return of every *Lustrum*, or four years end. It was indeed a very grievous tax, especially upon the poor; for not the meanest tradesman was exempted from it. Evagrius says,[6] it was exacted "even of those, who made begging their trade,—Ἐξ ἐράνης τὴν τροφὴν πορίζουσι." Whence Libanius calls it[7] "the intolerable tax of silver and gold, that made men dread the terrible *Pentaeteris*, or return of every fifth year." And for the same reason, as the author under the name of St. Austin takes notice,[8] it was commonly called, *Aurum Pannosum, the poor man's tax*, or as some editions read it, *Aurum Pæno-*

[1] Evagr. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. c. 39. [2] Zosim. lib. ii. [3] Baron. An. 330. n. 36. [4] Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Th. lib. xiii. tit. i. de Lustrali Collat. leg. i. Pagi. Critic. in Baron. An. 330. n. 6. [5] Basil. Ep. 243. [6] Evagr. lib. iii. c. 39. [7] Liban. Orat. 14. cont. Florent. tom. ii. p. 437. Φόρος ἀφόρητος, ἄργυρος καὶ χρυσὸς, φρίττειν προσιόσας ποιῶν τὰς δεινὰς πενταετηρίδας. [8] Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. c. 75. Didrachma capitum vel tributi exactio intelligitur; quod nunc Pannosum Aurum appellatur, quia et pauperes exiguntur.

sum, the cruel tax, because it was exacted of the poor. But now a particular respect was paid to the Church in this matter; for when her revenues were scanty, and not sufficient to give all the clergy a decent maintenance, the inferior orders, the *Clerici*, were allowed to traffic to support themselves, without paying any tribute of this nature. This indulgence was first granted by Constantius without any restriction,[1] "That if any of them were minded to follow a calling to maintain themselves, they should be freed from custom." But, that none of them might abuse this privilege to covetousness, they were confined afterwards by several laws to trade within a certain sum, which if they exceeded, they were to pay custom for it. This appears from a second law of the same Constantius,[2] and another of Gratian's,[3] where the Italian and Illyrican *Clerici* are confined to the sum of ten solids, and the Gallican, to fifteen. Yet if any would trade further, only with a charitable design, to raise funds and *monte-pios* for the use of the poor, they were allowed, by two other laws of Constantius,[4] to employ what sums they pleased, and pay none of this tribute for them. It is to be noted further, that this immunity was granted by Honorius to the Catholic clergy only,[5] and to no others. And the privilege was esteemed so great, that some covetous tradesmen would use means to get them-

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. viii. Si qui de vobis alimoniæ causâ negotiationem exercere volunt, immunitate potientur. It. Cod. lib. xiii. tit. 1. de Lustrali Collat. leg. i. Negotiatores omnes protinùs convenit aurum argentumque præbere: Clericos excipi tantùm, (et) qui Copiatæ appellantur, nec alium quenquam esse immunem. [2] Ibid. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 15. Clerici verò, vel hi quos Copiatas recens usus instituit nuncupari, ita à sordidis muneribus debent immunes atque à Conlatione præstari, si exiguis admodum mercimoniis tenuem sibi victum vestitumque conquirent. [3] Cod. Th. lib. xiii. tit. 1. de Lustrali Collat. leg. 11. Etsi omnes mercatores spectat Lustralis auri depensio, Clerici tamen intra Illyricum et Italiam in denis solidis; intra Galliam in quinis denis solidis immunem usum conversationis exerceant. Quicquid autem supra hunc modum negotiationis versabitur, id oportet ad functionem aurariam devocari. [4] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. 10. Negotiatorum dispendiis minimè obligentur (Clerici,) cùm certum sit, quæstus quos ex tabernaculis (leg. tabernis) atque ergasteriis colligunt, pauperibus profuturos. Ibid. leg. 14. Si quid mercaturâ congesserint, in usum pauperum atque egentium ministrari oportet, &c. [5] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. leg. 36. Catholicæ religionis Clerici. - - - ab aurariâ pensione habeantur immunes.

selves admitted to a titular office among the inferior clergy of the Church, with no other design but to enjoy this immunity, and to follow their trade without paying the lustral duty. Against whose fraudulency and corruptions the emperor Arcadius made a severe law,[1] commanding all such, if they followed their merchandize, to be deprived of this immunity of the clergy; or if they would devote themselves to the sacred service, then they should abstain from all such fraudulent and crafty ways of gain: "for," saith he, "the wages of religion and craft are very different from one another." And for this reason probably, when the revenues of the Church were become sufficient to maintain all the clergy, Valentinian the Third enacted a law,[2] "that none of the clergy should negociate as formerly; otherwise they should come under the cognizance of the secular judges, and not enjoy the privilege of the clergy." Evagrius adds[3], "that the emperor Anastasius quite abolished the *Chrysargyrum*, or *lustral tax* itself;" and that is the reason, why there is no mention at all made of it afterward in the Justinian Code.

SECT. 7.—Of the *Metatum*. What meant thereby, and the Exemption of the Clergy from it.

Another sort of duty incumbent on the subjects of the empire, was the burden and charge of giving entertainment to the emperor's court and retinue, when they had occasion to travel; or to the judges, or soldiers, as they passed from one place to another. This the civil law calls *Metatum*,[4] and the Greeks Μετάτον, from the word, *Metatores*, which signifies the emperors' *harbingers* or *fore-runners*, who were sent before to provide lodging and entertainment for them.

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xiii. tit. i. de Lustrali Collat. leg. 16. Omnes corporatos - - - præcipimus conveniri, ut aut commoda negotiatorum sequentes, à Clericorum excusatione discedant: aut Sacratissimo Numini servientes, versutis quæstibus abstineant; distincta enim stipendia sunt religionis et calliditatis.

[2] Valentin. Novel. 12. ad Calcem. Cod. Theod. Jubemus ut Clerici nihil prorsus negotiationis exerceant. Si velint negotiari, sciant se judicibus subditos, Clericorum privilegio non muniti.

[3] Evagr. lib. iii. c. 39.

[4] Cod. Th. lib. vii. tit. 8. de Onere Metati. Cod. Justin. lib. xii. tit. 41. de Metatis.

In allusion to which, Cyprian speaking of Rogatian, an eminent presbyter of Carthage, who was the first martyr that was sent to prison in the Decian persecution, says,[1] "he was *Metator* to the rest, *their harbinger*, that went before them to prepare a place in prison for them." And in the same sense Lucian, the martyr, in Cyprian, elegantly styles Decius himself,[2] "*Metatorem Antichristi, the harbinger of Antichrist*," who by that terrible persecution made preparation for his coming into the world. From this notion of the word, *Metator*, that duty of yielding entertainment to the emperor's retinue, &c. has the name of *Metatum* in the two codes of the civil law. But the clergy were excused from this by a law of Constantius,[3] where he says they should not be obliged to entertain strangers; by which he cannot be supposed to excuse them from the Christian duty of hospitality to the indigent, but from this civil duty of the Roman state, to which other subjects were obliged. Whence Gothofred very truly observes,[4] "that the clergy in this respect had equal privileges with senators' houses, and Jewish synagogues, and Christian Churches; all which were exempt from this duty of entertaining. And if the Greek collector of the Ecclesiastical Constitutions out of the Code, published by Fabrottus, mistake not, this immunity extended to their servants also. For he says,[5] "neither the clergy nor their servants were subject to any new impositions, or to this burden called the *Metatum*."

SECT. 8.—Of the *Superindicta* and *Extraordinaria*. The Clergy exempt from them.

And hence it appears further, that they were freed from all exactions, which went by the name of *Superindicta* and

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. 81. al. 6. Edit. Oxon. Primum hospitium vobis in carcere præparavit, et metator quodammodo vester nunc quoque vos antecedit.
[2] Lucian. ap. Cypr. Ep. 20. al. 22. [3] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 8. Præterea neque hospites suscipietis. [4] Gothofred. Paratitlon ad Cod. Th. lib. vii. tit. 8. de Onere Metati. tom. ii. p. 264. Immunes erant à Metato Clerici, Senatorum domus, synagogæ Judæorum, et Religionum loca. [5] Collect. Constit. Eccles. ex Cod. lib. i. tit. 3. sect. 1. Ὁι κληρικοὶ ἢ τὰ ἀνδράποδα αὐτῶν οὐχ ὑπόκεινται καιναῖς εἰσφοραῖς ἢ μετάτοις.

Extraordinaria, that is, such impositions, as the emperors thought necessary to lay upon the empire, or any part of it, beyond the ordinary canonical taxes, upon great exigencies and extraordinary occasions. For as the ordinary taxes were called indictions, so these extraordinary were called superindictions.[1] From these the clergy were universally exempted by several laws of Christian emperors. As by that of Constantius in the Theodosian Code,[2] where he refers to a preceding law to the same purpose. "According to the decree," says he, "which you are said to have obtained heretofore, no one shall impose any new taxes upon you, or your servants, but you shall enjoy a perfect immunity in that respect." Gothofred upon the place says, by this law they were freed from all extraordinary tribute, and only bound to the ordinary and canonical taxes. And so it was in the time of Honorius and Theodosius Junior, Anno 412, when, by a law granting many other privileges to the Church relating to her possessions, they insert this among the rest,[3] "that no extraordinary tribute or superindiction, but only the common canonical tax, should be required of her." Which was finally confirmed by Justinian,[4] and made the standing law of the Roman empire.

SECT. 9.—The Clergy sometimes exempt from Contributing to the Reparation of Highways and Bridges.

As to some other duties and burdens, the laws a little varied. For sometimes the clergy were exempted, and sometimes not; as particularly in the case of contributing to the maintenance and reparation of public ways and bridges.

---

[1] Vid. Cod. Theod. lib. xi. tit. 6. de Superindicto, et Cod. Justin. lib. x. tit. 18. de eodem. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. 8. Juxta sanctionem, quamdudum meruisse perhibemini, et vos et mancipia vestra nullus novis collationibus obligavit (id est, obligabit,) sed vacatione gaudebitis. Gothofred. in Loc. Ab. extraordinariis Collationibus immunes facti fuerunt, at nondum ab ordinariis et canonicis. [3] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. 40. Nihil extraordinarium ab hâc superindictitiumve flagitetur. - - - Nihil præter canonicam inlationem ejus functionibus ascribatur. [4] Justin. Novel. 131. c. 5. Sancimus omnium sanctarum Ecclesiarum possessiones, neque sordidas functiones, neque extraordinarias descriptiones sustinere.

By the forementioned law of Honorius,[1] Anno 412, all Church-lands are excused from those duties, and it is called an injury to bind them to any contribution toward them. Yet not long after, Anno 423, Theodosius Junior made a law for the eastern empire,[2] which excepts no order of men from bearing a share in this matter, but obliges, as well his own possessions, (called *Domus Divinæ* in the style and language of those times,) as Churches, to take their proportion in it. And about the same time Valentinian the Third made a law[3] to the same effect in the west. Justinian confirmed the law of Theodosius by inserting it into his Code,[4] and added another law of his own among his Novels,[5] where though he grants the clergy an immunity from extraordinary taxes, yet he adds, "That if there was occasion to make a way, or build or repair a bridge, then Churches as well as other possessors should contribute to those works, if they had possessions in any city, where such works were to be done." And so, Anno 742, King Ethelbald, in the synod of Cliff or Clovesha, granted an immunity to Church-lands; excepting payments to an expedition, and building bridges and castles.

SECT. 10.—As also from the Duty called *Angariæ*, and *Parangariæ*, &c.

The laws varied likewise in another instance of duty required of the subjects, which was to furnish out horses and carriages for conveying of corn for the soldiers, and such other things as belonged to the emperor's exchequer. This duty in the civil law[6] goes by the name of *Cursus*

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. 40. Nullam jugationem, quæ talium privilegiorum sorte gratulatur, muniendi itineris constringat injuria. - - - Nulla pontium instauratio; nulla translationum sollicitudo gignatur. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xv. tit. 3. de Itin. Muniend. leg. 6. Ad instructiones reparationesque itinerum pontiumque nullum genus hominum—cessare oportet. Domos etiam divinas, ac venerandas Ecclesias tam laudabili titulo libenter adscribimus. [3] Valentin. Novel. 21. ad Calcem. Cod. Th. [4] Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 2. leg. 7. [5] Just. Novel. 131. c. 5. Si tamen itineris sternendi aut pontium ædificii vel reparationis opus fuerit, ad instar aliorum possessorum, hujusmodi opus et sanctas Ecclesias et venerabiles Domos complere, dum sub illâ possident civitate, sub quâ tale fit opus.
[6] Cod. Th. lib. viii. tit. 5. de Cursu Publico, Angariis, et Parangariis. Cod. Justin. lib. xii. tit. 51.

Publicus, and *Angariæ*, and *Parangariæ*, and *Translatio*, and *Evectio*, and the horses used in this service are particularly called *Paraveredi*, and *Equi Cursuales*. Now the clergy at first were exempt from this service by two laws of Constantius made in the former part of his reign,[1] which expressly excuse, both their persons and their estates, from the duty of the *Parangariæ*. But by another law in the last year of his reign, Anno 360, he revoked this privilege, obliging the clergy to the duty of translation, as it is there worded,[2] by which he means this duty of furnishing horses and carriages for the emperor's service. And this he did, notwithstanding that the council of Ariminum had petitioned for an immunity, being at a time when Constantius was displeased with them. However this law continued in force, not only under Julian, but under Valentinian and Theodosius, till by a contrary law about twenty years after,[3] Anno 382, they restored the clergy to their ancient privilege; which was further confirmed to them by Honorius,[4] Anno 412, whose law is still extant in both the Codes. Yet Theodosius Junior and Valentinian the Third, Anno 440, took away their privilege again, and, by two laws,[5] made Church-lands liable to these burdens of the *Angariæ*, *Parangariæ*, &c. whenever the emperor should be upon any march or expedition, as well as all others. From all which it appears, that there was no certain rule

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. 10. Parangariarum quoque parili modo (à Clericis) cesset exactio. Ibid. leg. 14. Ad Parangariarum quoque præstationem non vocentur, nec eorundem facultates atque substantiæ. [2] Cod. Th. Ibid. leg. 15. Ut prætereà ad universa munia sustinenda, translationesque faciendas, omnes Clerici debeant adtineri.
[3] Cod. Theod. lib. 11. tit. 16. de Extraord. et Sordid. Muner. leg. 15. Circa Ecclesias, rhetores, atque grammaticos eruditionis utriusque, vetusto more durante. - - - Ne paraveredorum hujusmodi viris aut parangariarum præbitio mandetur, &c. [4] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Epis. et Cler. leg. 40. Nulla translationum sollicitudo gignatur, &c. al. signetur, as it is in the Justin. Code, lib. i. tit. 2. de Sacrosanct. Eccl. leg. 5. [5] Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 2. leg. 11. Neminem ab angariis, vel parangariis, vel plaustris, vel quolibet munere excusari præcipimus, cùm ad felicissimam expeditionem Nostri Numinis, omnium provincialium per loca, quà iter arripimus, debeant solita nobis ministeria exhiberi; licèt ad Sacrosanctas Ecclesias possessiones pertineant. It. lib. xii. tit. 51. de Cursu Publico. leg. 21. Nullus penitus cujuslibet ordinis seu dignitatis, vel Sacrosancta Ecclesia, vel Domus Regia tempore expeditionis excusationem angariarum, seu parangariarum habeat.

observed in this matter, but the clergy had, or had not this privilege, according as the state of affairs would bear, or as the emperors were inclined to grant it.

SECT. II.—Of the Tribute called, *Denarismus*, *Unciæ*, and *Descriptio Lucrativorum*; and the Church's Exemption from it.

Besides these public taxes and duties, there was also one private tax, from which all lands given to the Church, or to any charitable use, were exempt by the laws of the empire. This in the civil law is called *Denarismus*, or *Unciæ*, and *Descriptio Lucrativorum*. The reason of which names will be understood by explaining the nature of the tribute. It was a sort of tax paid, not to the emperors, but to the *Curia* or *Curiales* of every city, that is, to that body of men, who were obliged by virtue of their estates to be *members of the court* or *common-council*, and bear the offices of their country. Now it sometimes happened, that one of these *Curiales* left his estate to another, that was not of the *Curia*; and an estate, so descending, was said to come to him "*ex causâ lucrativâ*," which, being opposed to "*Causa onerosa*," is when a man enjoys an estate by gift or legacy, and not by purchase. But now, lest in this case the giving away an estate from the *Curia* might have brought a greater burden upon the remaining part of the *Curiales*, the person so enjoying it was obliged to pay an annual tribute to the *Curia* of the city, which, from the nature of his tenure, was called *Descriptio Lucrativorum, the lucrative tax:* and because every head of land, every *Jugum* or *Caput*, as the law terms it, was obliged to pay annually a *Denarius*, or *ounce of silver*, therefore the tax itself was called, *Unciæ* and *Denarismus*; as in the laws of Theodosius the Great, cited in the margin.[1] Theodosius Junior and Valentinian the Third made this tax double,[2] laying four *Siliquæ*, which is two

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xii. tit. I. de Decurionibus. leg. 107. Quicunque hæres Curiali - - - vel si quem liberalitas locupletaverit forte viventis, quos à Curiæ nexu conditio solet dirimere, sciant, pecuniariis descriptionibus - - - ad denarismum sive uncias, sese auctoris sui nomine retinendum. It. Leg. 123. Ibid. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xii. tit. 4. de Imponendâ Lucrativis descriptione, leg. unic. Hi qui ex lucrativâ causâ possessiones detinent, quæ aliquando Curialium fuerint, pro singulis earum jugis et capitibus quaternas siliquas annuas (leg. annuas) ordinibus nomine descriptionis exsolvant.

ounces of silver, upon every head of land. According to which rate, every possessor, who held any estate by the aforesaid tenure, was obliged to pay tribute out of it to the *Curia* of the city, to which it belonged. But if any such estate was given to the Church, it was exempt from this tribute, if not before, yet at least in the time of Justinian. For there are two laws of his to this purpose,[1] the one in his Code, the other in his Novels, in both which such lands, as any of the *Curiales* gave to a church, or a monastery, or hospital of any kind, are particularly excepted from this *lucrative* tax; and that, "*Pietatis intuitu*," as it is there worded, "*in regard to religion*, and because it was fit to put some difference between things human and divine." But whether the church enjoyed this immunity under any other prince before Justinian, is what I leave the curious to make the subject of a further inquiry; whilst I proceed to consider another sort of immunity of the clergy, which was their exemption from civil offices in the Roman empire.

SECT. 12.—The Clergy exempt from all Civil Personal Offices.

Of these offices some were personal, and others predial, that is, such as were tied to men's estates and possessions. Some again were called, *Honores, honourable offices;* and others, *Munera Sordida, mean and sordid offices.* Now, from all these, as well patrimonial as personal, honourable as well as sordid, by the first laws of Constantine, the clergy were universally and entirely exempt. But after-ages made a little distinction as to such of the clergy, who enjoyed patrimonial secular estates of their own, distinct from those of the Church; for such of the clergy were sometimes forced to leave their ecclesiastical employment, and bear the civil offices of the empire;—of which more by and by. But as

---

[1] Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 2. de Sacrosanct. Eccles. leg. 22. Sancimus res ad venerabiles ecclesias, vel xenones, vel monasteria, vel orphanotrophia, vel gerontocomia, vel ptochotrophia, &c. descendentes ex qualicunque curiali liberalitate - - - à lucrativorum inscriptionibus liberas immunesquè esse. - - - Cur enim non faciemus discrimen inter res divinas et humanas? Id. Novel. 131. c. 5. Si quæ verò res ex Curialium substantiis ad quamlibet sacrosanctam ecclesiam, aut aliam venerabilem domum secundum leges venerant, aut posteà venerint, liberas eas esse sancimus decriptione lucrativorum.

to offices, which were purely personal, the clergy were entirely exempt from them; as appears from a law of Valentinian and Gratian,[1] still extant in both the Codes, where every order of the clergy, not only presbyters and deacons, but subdeacons, exorcists, readers, door-keepers, and acolythists, are specified as exempt from personal offices: and that is the meaning of that law of Constantius, mentioned both by Athanasius,[2] and Socrates,[3] and Sozomen,[4] where they say, he granted the clergy of Ægypt, "Ἀλειτουργησίαν," and "Ἀτέλειαν λειτουργημάτων,"—exemption from such offices, as had been forced upon them in the Arian persecution.

SECT. 13.—And from Sordid Offices both Predial and Personal.

Again, for those called sordid offices, not only the persons of the clergy, but the estates of the Church were discharged of all burdens of that nature. Constantius made two laws to this purpose,[5] which Valentinian and Theodosius confirmed, granting the clergy, and some other orders of men, the same immunity in this respect, as they did to the chief officers and dignitaries of the empire; and they intimate,[6] also, that this was no new privilege, but what by ancient custom they had always enjoyed. The same is said by Honorius, that this was an ancient privilege of the Church, conferred upon her by his royal ancestors, and that it ought not to be diminished; therefore he made two laws particularly in behalf of the bishop of Rome,[7] "that no extraordinary office or sordid function should be imposed upon him." Nor do we ever find the clergy called to bear any such of-

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. 24. Presbyteros, diaconos, subdiaconos, exorcistas, lectores, ostiarios etiam, et omnes perinde qui primi sunt, personalium munerum expertes esse præcipimus. The Justinian Code lib. i. tit. 3. leg. 6. has the same, only instead of the words, Omnes qui primi sunt, it reads Acolythos. [2] Athan. Apol. 2. t. i. p. 772. [3] Socrat. lib. ii. c. 23. [4] Sozom. lib. iii. c. 21. [5] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 10 et 14. Repellatur ab his exactio munerum sordidorum. [6] Ibid. lib. xi. tit. 16. de Extraord. et Sordid. Muner. leg. 15. Maximarum culmina dignitatum - - - ab omnibus sordidis muneribus vindicentur. - - - Circa Ecclesias, rhetores, atque grammaticos eruditionis utriusque vetusto more durante, &c. [7] Ibid. leg. 21 et 22. Privilegia venerabilis Ecclesiæ, quæ Divi Principes contulerunt, imminui non oportet: proinde etiam quæ circa Urbis Romæ Episcopum, observatio intemerata custodiet. Ita ut nihil extraordinarii muneris vel sordidæ functionis agnoscat.

fice in the empire. For though Gothofred, in his Notes upon the forementioned law of Theodosius,[1] where several of these offices are specified, reckons the *Angariæ*, and building and repairing of ways and bridges among sordid offices; yet I have showed before, that what was exacted of the clergy in reference to those two things, was under the notion of a tribute, and not an office. And the laws, which require the clergy to contribute toward them, say expressly,[2] that they are not to be looked upon as sordid offices, nor any duty to be exacted under that notion."

SECT 14.—Also from Curial or Municipal Offices.

As to the other sort of offices called *Honores, honourable* or *municipal offices,* which are otherwise termed *curial offices,* because they, who bare them, were called *Curiales et Decuriones, men of the court* or *curia* of every city; all the clergy, who had no lands of their own, but lived upon the revenues and possessions of the Church, were entirely exempt from them, because the duties of the Church and State were not thought well consistent in one and the same person; and it was deemed unreasonable to burden the lands of the Church with the civil duties of the empire. When Constantine was first quietly settled in his government, immediately after the great Decennial, commonly called the Dioclesian persecution, he seems to have granted a full and unlimited immunity in this respect to all the clergy, as well those, who had lands or patrimony of their own, as those, who lived wholly upon the revenues of the Church. For thus he expresses himself in a law directed to Anulinus, proconsul of Afric, recorded by Eusebius, which bears date, Anno 312, or 313: "our pleasure is, that all those in your province, who minister in the Catholic Church, over which Cæcilian presides,[3] who are commonly called

[1] Gothofred. in Cod. Th. lib. xi. tit. 16. leg. 15. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xv. tit. 3. de Itin. Muniend. leg. 6. Honor. et Theodos. Jun. Absit ut nos instructionem viæ publicæ, et pontium. stratarumque operam. - - - inter sordida munera numeremus, &c. Vid. Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 2. de SS. Eccles. leg. 7. Ejusdem Honorii et Theodos. [3] Const. Ep. ad Anulin. ap. Euseb. lib. x. c. 7. Ὅυσπερ κληρικοὺς ἐπονομάζειν εἰώθασιν, ἀπὸ πάντων ἀπαξαπλῶς τῶν λειτουργιῶν βούλομαι ἀλειτουργήτους διαφυλαχθῆναι, &c.

the clergy, be exempted from all public offices whatsoever, that they may not be let or hindered in the performance of divine service by any sacrilegious distraction." Anulinus has also an Epistle still extant in St. Austin,[1] written to Constantine not long after, wherein he mentions this grant as sent to him, to be intimated to Cæcilian and the Catholic clergy, viz. "that by the kind indulgence of his majesty they were exempt from all manner of offices, that they might with due reverence attend divine service." And this Epistle of Anulinus is also related, but not so correctly, in the Collation of Carthage.[2] In this grant it is very observable, that this privilege was only allowed to the Catholic clergy; which made the Donatists very uneasy, because they could not enjoy the same favour: and upon this they became tumultuous and troublesome to the Catholics, procuring the clergy in some places to be nominated to public offices, and to be made receivers of the public revenues, &c. But complaint hereof being made to Constantine, it occasioned the publishing of a new order in Afric, pursuant to the former, "that whereas he was given to understand, that the clergy of the Catholic Church[3] were molested by the heretical faction, and by their procurement nominated to public offices, and made susceptors or receivers of tribute, in derogation of the privileges, which he had formerly granted them; he now signified his pleasure again, that if the magistrates found any persons so aggrieved, they should substitute another in his room, and take care for the future, that no such injuries should be offered to the men of that profession." This law was pub-

---

[1] Anulin. Ep. ad Constant. ap. Aug. Ep. 68. Scripta cœlestia Majestatis vestræ accepta atque adorata, Cæciliano et his qui sub eodem agunt, quique Clerici appellantur, devotio parvitatis meæ insinuare curavit, eosdemque hortata est, ut unitate consensu omnium factâ, cum *omni omninò munere* indulgentiâ majestatis vestræ liberati esse videantur Catholici, custoditâ sanctitate legis, debitâ reverentiâ divinis rebus inserviant. [2] Collat. Carth. Die. iii, c, 216 et 220. [3] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 1. Hæreticorum factione comperimus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Clericos ita vexari, ut nominationibus seu susceptionibus aliquibus, quas publicus mos exposcit, contra indulta sibi privilegia, prægraventur. Ideòque placet, si quem tua Gravitas invenerit ita vexatum, eidem alium subrogari, et deinceps à supradictæ religionis hominibus hujusmodi injurias prohiberi.

lished, Anno 313, and it is the first of this kind that is extant in the Theodosian Code. About six years after, Anno 319, he put forth another, upon a like complaint made in Italy, that the clergy were called away from their proper functions to serve in public offices; and in this[1] he grants them the same general immunity as before. So again, Anno 330, a complaint being made against the Donatists in Numidia, that, when they could not have their will upon the superior clergy by reason of the former immunity that was granted them, they notwithstanding forced the inferior clergy to bear offices *in Curia*, upon pretence that the exemption did not extend to them; Constantine, to cut off all dispute, published another law,[2] wherein he particularly exempts the inferior clergy, readers, subdeacons, and the rest from bearing offices *in Curia;* and orders, that they should enjoy in Afric the same perfect immunity as they did in the oriental Churches.

SECT. 15.—But this last Privilege confined to such of the Clergy, as had no Estates but what belonged to the Church, by the Laws of Constantine.

Now this immunity was so great a privilege, that it not only became the envy of heretics, but also provoked some catholic laymen, who were possessed of estates qualifying them to bear the offices of their country, to get a sort of titular ordination to some of the inferior offices of the Church, on purpose to enjoy this immunity; when yet they neither designed to do the duty of that office, nor to arise to any higher order in the Church. Which being interpreted a mere fraudulent collusion to deprive the state of fit men to serve the commonwealth, and no ways benefit the Church, it was presently resented by Constantine as an abuse; and various laws were made both by him and his successors, as occasion required, to restrain and correct it.

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2 de Episc. leg. 2. Qui divino cultui ministeria religionis impendunt, id est, hi qui Clerici appellantur, ab omnibus omninò muneribus excusentur: ne sacrilego livore quorundam a divinis obsequiis avocentur.

[2] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. leg. 7. Lectores divinorum apicum, et hypodiaconi, cæterique Clerici, qui per injuriam Hæreticorum ad Curiam devocati sunt, absolvantur: et de cætero ad similitudinem Orientis minimè ad Curias devocentur, sed immunitate plenissimâ potiantur.

Constantine at first, as I observed before, granted this immunity indifferently to all the clergy, as well possessors, as not possessors of private estates, whom he found actually engaged in the service of the Church, when he came to the quiet possession of the empire; nor did he for some years after perhaps restrain any sorts of men from taking orders in the Church: but when he found this indulgence to the Church, by the artifice of cunning men, only turned to the detriment of the state; and that rich men sheltered themselves under an ecclesiastical title, only to avoid the offices of their country; he then made a law, that no rich plebeian, who was qualified by his estate to serve *in Curia*, and bear civil offices in any city, should become an ecclesiastic; or if he did, he should be liable from the time, that law was made, to be fetched back and returned *in Curiam*, to bear the offices of his country as a layman. What year that law was made, is not very certain, save only, that it was before the year 320, when a second law was made upon the same subject, referring to the first. And from this we learn what was the import of both;—that it was Constantine's design to put a distinction betwixt such of the clergy, as were ordained before that first law, and such, as were ordained afterward; the former he exempted from civil offices, though they were possessed of estates, but not the latter. Which plainly appears from the words of the second law, which are these;[1] "whereas by a former law we ordained, that from thenceforward no counsellor or counsellor's son, nor any one, who by his estate was sufficiently qualified to bear public offices, should take upon him the name or function of the clergy, but only such, whose fortune is small, and they not tied to any civil offices; we are now

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 3. Cum constitutio emissa præcipiat, nullum deinceps decurionem, vel ex decurione progenitum, vel etiam instructum idoneis facultatibus, atque obeundis publicis muneribus opportunum, ad Clericorum nomen obsequiumque confugere; sed eos - - qui fortuna tenues, neque muneribus civilibus teneantur obstricti: cognovimus illos etiam inquietari, qui ante legis promulgationem Clericorum se consortio sociaverint: ideòque præcipimus, his ab omni molestiâ liberatis, illos qui post legem latam obsequia publica declinantes, ad Clericorum numerum confugerunt, Curiæ Ordinibusque restitui, et civilibus obsequiis inservire.

given to understand, that such of the clergy, who were ordained before the promulgation of that law, are molested upon that account. Wherefore our command is, that those be discharged of all further trouble; and that such only, as entered themselves among the clergy since the law was made, with intention to decline public offices, shall be returned to the *Curia* and states of their city, to serve in the civil offices of their country." There is another law of Constantine's published after this,[1] Anno 326, a year after the council of Nice, which speaks to the same effect, and shows, that this was the standing rule of the latter part of Constantine's reign, to exempt none among the clergy, who were qualified by estates of their own, from bearing personally the public offices of the empire.

SECT. 16.—Constantine's Laws a little altered by the succeeding Emperors in Favour of the Church.

But however this might be well designed at first by him to prevent some abuses, yet in process of time it became very prejudicial to the Church. For by this means sometimes presbyters and deacons, after they had been twenty or thirty years in the Church's service, were called upon by litigious men to bear civil offices, inconsistent with the spiritual, and thereupon they were forced to forsake their ecclesiastical function. This was so great an inconvenience, that it well became the wisdom of the following emperors to find out some suitable remedy for it; which they did by new modifying Constanstine's law, and abating something of the rigour of it. For they did not lay the burden of civil offices upon the persons of the clergy, but only upon their patrimonial estates, not belonging to the Church, and in some cases they excused those also. Constantius acquitted all bishops of this burden, both as to their estates and persons;[2] for by his laws they might keep their estates

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. leg. 6. Si inter Civitatem et Clericos super alicujus nomine dubitetur, si eum æquitas ad publica trahat munera, et progenie municeps, vel patrimonio idoneus dignoscetur, exemptus Clericis Civitati tradatur: opulentos enim Seculi subire necessitates oportet, pauperes Ecclesiarum divitiis sustentari. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xii. tit. 1. de Decurion. leg. 49. Episcopum facultates suas Curiæ, sicut ante fuerat constitutum, nullus adigat mancipare, sed antistes maneat, nec faciat Substantiæ cessionem, &c.

to themselves, and neither be obliged to bear civil offices in person, nor substitute any other in their room. And he allowed the same privilege to presbyters, and deacons, and all others, provided they were ordained by the consent of the civil court or *Curia*, and the general request of the people. But, if they were not so ordained, all that they were obliged to do, was only to part with two thirds of their estate to their children or next relations, and substitute them in their room; or in defect of such relations, to give up two parts of their estate to the *Curia*, and retain the third to themselves. Valentinian in the first year of his reign, Anno 364, made the law a little stricter,[1] "that such persons, when they were ordained, should give all their estate to one of their relations, and substitute him as a *Curialis* in their room, or else give it up to the *Curia* itself: otherwise they should be liable to be called back to serve in civil offices as laymen." But he extended this obligation no further than to the beginning of his own reign; for by another law,[2] made seven years after, Anno 371, he exempted all such, as were in the service of the Church when he came to the crown, though they had estates of their own qualifying them to bear civil offices. Valens[3] exempted all such as had been ten years in the Church's service; so that, if they were not called upon by the civil courts within that term, they were for ever after to be excused. Valentinian the Second[4] exempted them, provided they put a substitute in their room. Theodosius[5] exempted all that were ordained before the year 388, which was the tenth year of his reign: and of those that were ordained afterward he only required the aforesaid conditions,[6] "that they should either provide a

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xii. tit. 1. de Decurion, leg. 59. Qui partes eligit Ecclesiæ, aut in propinquum bona propria conferendo eum pro se faciet curialem, aut facultatibus Curiæ cedat, quam reliquit; ex necessitate revocando eo qui neutrum fecit, cùm Clericus esse cœpisset, &c. [2] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 21. Qui Ecclesiæ juge obsequium deputarunt, Curiis habeantur immunes, si tamen ante ortum Imperii nostri ad cultum se legis nostræ contulisse constiterit. [3] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. leg. 19. Si in consortio Clericatûs decennium quietis impleverit, cum patrimonio suo habeatur immunis: Si verò intra finitos annos fuerit à Curiâ revocatus, cum substantiâ suâ functionibus subjaceat Civitatis. [4] Cod. Th. lib. xii. tit. 1. de Decurion. leg. 99. [5] Ibid. leg. 121 et 123. [6] Ibid. leg. 104 et 115.

proper substitute, or give up their estates to the court at their ordination." Which is also taken notice of by St. Ambrose in his answer to Symmachus, where he shows,[1] how unreasonable it was for him to plead for the exemption of the heathen priests in this respect, when the laws did not grant it to the Christian clergy but upon such conditions. Arcadius indeed, by the instigation of Eutropius, Anno 398, cancelled all these favourable laws, and brought the clergy again to the hard rule of Constantine,[2] "that if any of the *Curiales* were ordained in the Church, they should by force be returned to the civil courts again in person, and not enjoy the benefit of those laws, which allowed them to take orders, provided they disposed of their estates to proper substitutes, who might bear offices in their stead." But this law was but very short lived; for Chrysostom and some others very justly declaiming against it, Arcadius disannulled it the year following by a new law, wherein[3] he granted such of the clergy, as were taken and ordained out of the body of the *Curiales*, the same privilege that they had under his father Theodosius, which was,—that all, that were ordained before the second consulship of Theodosius, Anno 388, should enjoy a perfect immunity without any molestation; and such, as were ordained after that term, if they were of the superior clergy, bishops, presbyters, or deacons, might continue in the Church's service, either providing a substitute to bear the offices of the *Curia* for them, or giving up their estates to the *Curia*, as former laws in that case had directed. Only it was required, that the inferior clergy, readers, subdeacons, &c. should be returned to the *Curia* again, and obliged to bear offices in person.

---

[1] Ambros. cont. Symmach. [2] Cod. Th. lib. ix. Tit. 45. De his qui ad Eccles. confug. leg. iii. Decuriones manu mox injectâ revocentur: quibus ulterius legem prodesse non patimur, quæ cessione patrimonii subsecutâ, decuriones esse Clericos non vetabat. [3] Cod. Th. lib. xii. tit. l. de Decurion. leg. 163. Si qui ex secundo Divi Patris nostri consulatu curiam relinquentes, clericorum se consortio manciparunt, si jam Episcopi, vel Presbyteri, vel Diaconi esse meruerunt, in sacris quidem et secretioribus Dei mysteriis perseverent, sed aut substitutum pro se Curiæ offerre cogantur, aut juxta legem dudum latam tradant Curiæ facultates. Residui omnes, Lectores, subdiaconi, vel hi Clerici quibus Clericorum privilegia non debentur, debitis mox patriæ muneribus præsententur.

And the same was determined by Theodosius Junior,[1] and Valentinian the Third,[2] and Majorian,[3] whose laws are extant at the end of the Theodosian Code. Justinian also has a Novel to the same purpose,[4] wherein he orders such of the inferior clergy, as were taken out of any *Curia*, to be returned thither again, unless they had lived fifteen years a monastic life; and then they were to give three parts of their patrimony to the *Curia*, and retain one to themselves. But he allowed bishops to put in a substitute, and be free from bearing civil offices in person, as Julianus Antecessor in his Epitome of the Authentics understands him.[5] Though I confess there is something to incline a man to think Justinian at first was a little more severe to such bishops, because he revived that antiquated law of Arcadius in his Code.[6] But however this be, upon the whole matter it appears, that the Christian princes from first to last always made a wide difference between the public patrimony of the Church, which was properly ecclesiastical, and the private estates of such of the clergy, as had lands of a civil or secular tenure; for the one, the clergy were obliged to no duty or burthen of civil offices, but for the other they were, and could not be excused from them, but either by parting with some portion of their estates, or providing proper substitutes to officiate for them. The reason of which was, that such of the clergy were looked upon as irregularly promoted; it being as much against the rules of the Church, as the laws of the State, to admit any of the *Curiales* to an ecclesiastical function, without first giving satisfaction to the *Curia*, whence they were taken, as has been showed in another place. I have been the more curious in searching to the bottom this business about tribute and civil offices, and given a particular and distinct account of them from the grounds of the civil law, because but few

---

[1] Theod. Novel. 26 et 38. [2] Valentin. Novel. 12. [3] Majorian. Novel. 1. [4] Justin. Novel. 123. c. 15. Ex. Epitom. Julian. Antecess. [5] Vid. Julian. Epit. Novel. 123. c. 4. post leg. 38. Cod. de Episc. Episcopalis ordo liberat à fortunâ servili, sed non à curiali sive officiali; nam et post ordinationem durat; ita ut per subjectam vel interpositam personam officium adimpleatur, &c. [6] Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 12.

men have recourse to those fountains, whence this matter is to be cleared; and the reader will scarce find this subject handled, but either very imperfectly, or with some partiality, or some confusion, in modern authors.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Revenues of the Ancient Clergy.

SECT. I.—Several Ways of providing a Fund for the Maintenance of the Clergy. 1st, by Oblations. Some of which were Weekly.

THE next thing, that comes in order to be considered, is the maintenance of the ancient clergy. Where it will be proper first to inquire into the ways and methods, that were taken for raising funds for their subsistence. And here, to set aside a little the consideration of tithes, which will be spoken of in the next chapter, we find other ways, by which, in ancient times, a decent provision was made for them. As first, by the voluntary oblations of the people, of which some learned persons think there were two sorts; 1st, the weekly or daily oblations, that were made at the altar; 2dly, the monthly oblations, that were cast into the treasury of the Church. The first sort of oblations were such, as every rich and able communicant made at his coming to partake of the eucharist; where they offered not only bread and wine, out of which the eucharist was taken, but also other necessaries, and sometimes sums of money, for the maintenance of the Church, and relief of the poor; as is evident from those words of St. Jerom, in his Comments upon Ezekiel,[1] where he tells us, "that thieves and oppressors made their oblations among others, out of their ill-gotten goods, that they might glory in their wickedness, while the deacon in the Church publicly recited the names of those that offered:—such an one offers so much, such an

[1] Hieron. Com. in Ezek. xviii. p. 537. Multos conspicimus, qui opprimunt per potentiam, vel furta committunt, ut de multis parva pauperibus tribuant, et in suis sceleribus glorientur, publicèque Diaconus in Ecclesiâ recitet Offerentium Nomina:—tantum offert ille, tantum ille pollicitus est;—placentque sibi ad plausum populi, torquente conscientiâ.

one hath promised so much:—and so they please themselves with the applause of the people, while their own conscience lashes and torments them." Those called the Apostolical Canons,[1] speak also of the oblation of fruits and fowls and beasts, but order such to be sent home to the bishop and presbyters, who were to divide them with the deacons, and the rest of the clergy.

SECT. 2.—And others Monthly.

Another sort of oblations were made monthly, when it was usual for persons, that were able and willing, to give, as they thought fit, something to the ark or treasury of the Church. Which sort of collation is particularly taken notice of by Tertullian,[2] who says, "it was made *Menstruâ die, once a month*, or when every one pleased, and as they pleased; for no man was compelled to it: it was not any stated sum, but a voluntary oblation." Baronius[3] thinks this ark or treasury was called the *Corban* of the Church, because Cyprian[4] uses that word, when he speaks of the offerings of the people; rebuking a rich and wealthy matron for coming to celebrate the eucharist without any regard to the *Corban*, and partaking of the Lord's Supper without any sacrifice of her own. Others conceive,[5] that *Corban* is not a name for the treasury, but signifies the gift or oblation itself; and that Cyprian so uses it, making it the same with the sacrifices or offerings of the people. But the evangelist, Mat. xxvii. 6, seems rather to favour the opinion of Baronius; for when he says, the chief priests did not think it lawful to put Judas's money, "εἰς τὸν κορβανᾶν," it is evident, he there by *Corban* means the treasury, as most translators render it.

---

[1] Canon Apost. c. 8, 4, 5. [2] Tertul. Apol. c. 39. Si quod arcæ genus est, non de ordinariâ summâ, quasi redemptæ religionis congregatur: modicam unusquisque stipem menstruâ die, vel quum velit, et si modo velit, et si modo possit, apponit: nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert.
[3] Baron. an. 44, n. 69. [4] Cypr. de Oper. et Eleemos. p. 203. Locuples et dives es, et dominicum celebrare te credis, quæ corbonam omninò non respicis; quæ in dominicum sine sacrificio venis; quæ partem de sacrificio, quod pauper obtulit, sumis? [5] Basnag. Exercit. in Baron. p. 597.

SECT. 3.—Whence came the Custom of a Monthly Division among the Clergy.

But however this be, it is very probable, that hence came the custom of dividing these oblations once a month among the clergy. For as Tertullian speaks of a monthly collation; so Cyprian frequently mentions[1] a monthly division, in which the presbyters had their shares by equal portions, and other orders after the same manner. Whence the clergy are also styled in his language[2] *Sportulantes fratres, partakers of the distribution;* and what we now call *Suspensio à beneficio,* is in his style,[3] *Suspensio à divisione mensurnâ, suspension from the monthly division.* Which plainly implies, that this sort of Church-revenues was usually divided once a month among the clergy. And perhaps in conformity to this custom it was, that the Theodosian heretics, having persuaded one Natalius, a confessor, to be ordained a bishop among them, promised him a monthly salary of one hundred and fifty *Denarii,*—"*μηνιαῖα δύνάρια ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα,*" as Eusebius words it,[4] referring to the usual way of distribution once a month among the clergy.

SECT. 4.—Secondly, other Revenues arising from the Lands and Possessions of the Church.

Another sort of revenues, which the clergy enjoyed, were such as arose annually from the lands and possessions, which were given to the Church. These indeed at first were but small, by reason of the continual vexations and persecutions, which the Church underwent for the three first ages, when immoveable goods were always most exposed to danger. It was the custom of the Church of Rome therefore never to keep any immoveable possessions, no, not for many ages, if we may credit Theodorus Lector,[5] who speaks of it as customary in his own time, Anno 520. But, if any such were given to the Church, they immediately sold them, and divided the price into three parts, giving

[1] Cypr. Ep. 34. al. 39. Ut et sportulis iisdem cum Presbyterls honorentur, et divisiones mensurnas æquatis quantitatibus partiantur. [2] Id. Ep. 66. al. 1. Sportulantes Fratres, tanquam decimas ex fructibus accipientes. [3] Id. Ep. 28. al. 34. Interim se à Divisione Mensurnâ tantum contineant, &c. [4] Euseb. lib. v. c. 28. [5] Theodor. Lect. Collectan. lib. ii. p. 567. Ἔθος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ της Ῥώμης ἀκίνητα μὴ κρατεῖν δίκαια, &c.

one to the Church, another to the bishop, and the third to the rest of the clergy. And Valesius finds no exception to this till near the time of Gregory the Great. But, if this was the custom of the Church of Rome, it was a very singular one. For other Churches had their immoveables, both houses and lands, even in the times of persecution; as appears from the edicts of Maximinus, wherein he revoked his former decrees, that had raised the persecution, and in these latter edicts granted the Christians liberty, not only to rebuild their Churches, but also ordered,[1] "that if any houses or lands belonging to them had been confiscated, or sold, or given away, they should be restored to them again." That this was meant of houses and lands belonging to the Church, as well as private Christians, is evident from the decree of Constantine and Licinius published the same year, Anno 313; wherein they give orders, that whereas the Christians were known to have not only places of assembly, but also other places belonging not to any private man, but to the whole body,[2] all such places should be restored to the body, and to every particular assembly among them. Which is repeated again in Constantine's letter to Anulinus,[3] and other public acts of his recorded by Eusebius in his life,[4] where he makes mention of houses, gardens, lands, and other possessions belonging to the Church, of which she had been plundred and despoiled in the late persecutions. These are undeniable evidences, that some part of the ecclesiastical revenues was anciently raised from houses and lands, settled upon the Church, even before any Christian emperors could give encouragement to them.

SECT. 5.—These very much augmented by the Laws of Constantine.

But, when Constantine was quietly settled upon the Throne, the Church-revenues received great augmentations in this kind. For he enacted a law at Rome, which is still extant in both the Codes,[5] "that any one whatsoever should

---

[1] Euseb. lib. ix. c. 10. [2] Ap. Euseb. lib. x. c. 5. [3] Constant. Ep. ad Anulin. ap. Euseb. ibid. [4] Euseb. Vit. Const. lib. ii. c. 37 et 39. [5] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 4. It. Cod. Justin.

have liberty at his death to bequeath by will what part of his goods he pleased to the holy Catholic Church." By which means the liberality of pious persons was very much encouraged, and great additions were made to the standing revenues of the Church. Therefore Baronius is very injurious[1] to the memory of Constantine, and justly corrected by Gothofred[2] and Mr. Pagi[3] for it, in that he insinuates, as if Constantine had relapsed toward heathenism at this very time, Anno 321, when he published this law so much in favour of the Church.

SECT 6.—Whose Laws were confirmed, and not revoked by the succeeding Emperors, as some mistake.

Others are no less injurious to some of his successors, when they represent them as injurious to the Church, in forbidding widows and orphans to leave any legacies to the Church. Baronius cannot help complaining also upon this point, though he contradicts himself about it. For in one place he says,[4] "the foresaid law of Constantine did so augment the Church's wealth, that the following emperors began to dread the consquences of it, that it would turn to the detriment and poverty of the commonwealth; and therefore they made laws to restrain the faithful from being so profuse in their donations to the Church." Yet when he comes to speak particularly of those laws,[5] he owns, "they were not designed against the Church, but only to correct the scandalous practices of some sordid monks and ecclesiastics, who being of an avaricious and parasitical temper made a gain of godliness, and under pretence of religion so screwed themselves into the favour and affections of some rich widows and orphans, that they prevailed upon them to leave them great legacies, and sometimes their whole

---

lib. i. tit. 2. de Sacrosanct. Eccles. leg. 1. Habeat unusquisque licentiam sanctissimo catholico venerabilique concilio, decedens bonorum quod optaverit relinquere. [1] Baron. an. 321. n. 18. [2] Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 10. de Paganis leg. 1. [3] Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 321. n. 4 et 5. [4] Baron. an. 321. n. 17. [5] Baron. an. 370. tom. iv. p. 270. Quâ quidem sanctione nequaquam prohibentur Ecclesiæ hæreditates accipere vel legata, sed ecclesiasticæ personæ, sive Clerici, sive Monachi. - - - ut planè intelligas hosce nebulones, tanquam harpyias quasdam inhiantes matronarum divitiis, &c.

estates, to the prejudice of the right heirs and next relations." Which was so dishonest and unbecoming a practice in such persons, that Valentinian made a law to prevent it, decreeing,[1] "that no ecclesiastics, nor any, that professed the monastic life, should frequent the houses of widows or orphans; nor be qualified to receive any gift or legacy from the donation or last will of any such persons." Which law, as Gothofred rightly observes,[2] did not prohibit them from leaving any thing to the Church; though some learned men so misunderstand it; but only tended to correct this unworthy practice of some particular persons, which is equally complained of by the ancient writers of the Church. St. Ambrose, and St. Jerom, and others mention this law, yet they do not at all inveigh against it, but against those vices that occasioned it. "I do not complain of the law," says St. Jerom,[3] "but am grieved, that we should deserve such a law; that when idol-priests and stage-players, and carters, and harlots may inherit, only clerks and monks are prohibited; and that, not by persecuting emperors, but Christian princes." He adds, "that it was a very prudent caution in the law, but yet it did not restrain the avarice of such persons; who found out an artifice to elude the law, *per fidei-commissa,—by getting others to receive in trust for them.*" Which shows us the sense St. Jerom had of this matter, that he did not think the emperors were injurious to the Church in making such a law, but those persons were only to be blamed, whose avarice and sordid flatteries compelled them to make it. And any one, that will consult St. Ambrose,[4] or the author under his name,[5] will find that they give the same account of it. Theodosius indeed some years after made a law,[6]

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 20. Ecclesiastici, vel qui continentium se volunt nomine nuncupari, viduarum aut pupillarum domos non adeant. - - - Censemus etiam, ut memorati nihil de ejus mulieris liberalitate quâcunque vel extremo judicio possint adipisci. [2] Gothofred in loc. [3] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. Sacerdotes, dicere pudet, idolorum, mimi, et aurigæ, et scorta hæreditates capiunt; solis clericis et monachis prohibetur: et prohibetur non à persecutoribus, sed à principibus Christianis. - - Nec de lege conqueror, sed doleo cur meruimus hanc legem, &c. [4] Ambros. Ep. 31. ad Valentin. p. 145. [5] Idem Homil. 7. [6] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 27. Nihil de monilibus et supellectili, nihil de

relating particularly to such deaconesses of the Church, as were of noble families, "that they should not dispose of their jewels, or plate, or furniture, or any other such things, as were the ancient marks of honour in their families, under pretence of religion, while they lived; nor make any Church, or clerk, or poor, their heirs, when they died." But as this law was made upon some particular reasons of state; so it did no harm to the Church; for within two months the same emperor recalled it by a contrary law,[1] which granted liberty to such deaconesses to dispose of their goods in their lifetime to any Church or clerk whatsoever. And Marcian made the law[2] a little more extensive, allowing deaconesses and all other religious women to dispose of any part of their estate, by will or codicil, to any Church, or oratory, or clerk, or monk, or poor whatsoever, Which law Justinian also confirmed and inserted it into his code.[3] So that Constantine's law continued always in its full force, and the succeeding princes did not derogate from the privilege, which he had granted the Church in this respect, for fear, as Baronius pretends, lest the liberality of the subject to the Church should impoverish the Commonwealth. Men were very liberal indeed in their gifts and donations to the Church in this age, but yet not so profuse, as to need statutes of mortmain to restrain them.

SECT 7.—Thirdly, another Part of Church-Revenues raised by Allowances out of the Emperor's Exchequer.

For besides the liberality of the subjects, the emperors in

---

auro, argento, cæterisque claræ domûs insignibus, sub religionis defensione consumat. - - - Ac si quando diem obierit, nullum ecclesiam, nullum clericum, nullum pauperem scribat hæredes, &c. [1] Ibid. leg. 28. Legem, quæ diaconissis vel Viduis nuper est promulgata, ne quis videlicèt clericus, neve sub Ecclesiæ nomine, mancipia, prædam, velut infirmi sexûs despoliator, et remotis adfinibus et propinquis, ipse sub prætextu catholicæ disciplinæ se ageret viventis hæredem, eatenùs animadvertat esse revocatam. [2] Marcian. Novel. 5. ad calcem Cod. Th. Generali lege sancimus, sive vidua, sive diaconissa, sive virgo Deo dicata, vel sanctimonialis mulier, sive quocunque alio nomine religiosi honoris vel dignitatis fœmina nuncupetur, testamento vel codicillo suo - - - Ecclesiæ, vel martyrio, vel clerico, vel monacho, vel pauperibus aliquid vel ex integro vel ex parte, in quâcunque re vel specie credidit relinquendum, id modis omnibus ratum firmumque constet. [3] Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 2. de Sacrosanct. Eccl. leg. 13.

these ages found it necessary to make the clergy an allowance out of the public revenues of the empire; which was another way of providing a maintenance for them. Constantine both gave the clergy particular largesses, as their occasions required, and also settled upon them a standing allowance out of the exchequer. In one of his epistles to Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, recorded by Eusebius,[1] he acquaints Cæcilian with his orders, which he had given to Ursus, his general-receiver in Afric, to pay him *three thousand pholles*,—τρισχιλίας φόλλεις,—to be divided at his discretion among the clergy of the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and the two Mauritania's. And, if this sum would not answer all their present necessities, he gave him further orders to demand of his procurator Heraclides, whatever he desired more. I need not stand here to inquire critically what this sum of 3000 pholles was, (though it may be computed above twenty thousand pounds,) since Constantine gave the bishop unlimited orders, to demand as much as the needs of the clergy should require. But he not only supplied their present necessities, but also gave orders for a standing allowance to be made them out of the public treasury. For Theodoret,[2] and Sozomen say,[3] he made a law requiring the chief magistrates in every province to grant the clergy, and virgins, and widows of the Church, *an annual allowance of corn*,—ἐτήσια σιτηρέσια,—out of the yearly tribute of every city. And thus it continued to the time of Julian, who withdrew the whole allowance. But Jovian restored it again in some measure, granting them a third part of the former allowance only, because at that time the public income was very low, by reason of a severe famine; but he promised them the whole, so soon as the famine was ended, and the public store-houses were better replenished. But either Jovian's death prevented his design, or the necessities of the clergy did not afterward require it. For though Sozomen seems to say, the whole was restored; yet Theodoret, who is more accurate, affirms, that it was only, τριτημόριον,—a third part;

[1] Euseb. lib. x. c. 6. [2] Theod. lib. i. c. 11. [3] Sozomen. lib. v. c. 5.

and that so it continued to his own times. In this sense therefore we are to understand that law of the emperor Marcian, which Justinian has inserted into his Code,[1] decreeing, "that the salaries, which had been always given to the Churches in diverse sorts of grain out of the public treasures, should be allowed them, without any diminution." This did not entitle them to the whole allowance first made them by Constantine, as some may be apt to imagine from the general words of the law, but only to the third part, which had been the customary allowance from the time of Jovian.

SECT. 8.—Fourthly, the Estates of Martyrs and Confessors dying without Heirs settled upon the Church by Constantine.

Another way, by which some small addition was made to the revenues of the Church, was from a law of Constantine, mentioned by Eusebius in his life,[2] where he tells us, "that, as he ordered all the estates of martyrs and confessors, and whoever had suffered in time of persecution, to be restored to their next relations; so, if any of them died without relations, the Church should become their heir, and, in every place where they lived, succeed to their inheritance."

SECT. 9.—Fifthly, the Estates of Clergymen, dying without Heirs and Will, settled in like manner.

Theodosius Junior and Valentinian the Third made such another law,[3] in reference to the temporal possessions of the clergy; "that, if any presbyter, or deacon, or deaconess, or subdeacon, or other clerk, or any man or woman professing a monastic life, died without will and without heirs, the estates and goods they were possessed of, should fall to the Church or monastery, to which they belonged, unless they were antecedently tied to some civil service." This implies, that the clergy were at liberty to dispose of their own tem-

[1] Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 2. de Sacrosanct. Eccles. leg. 12. Salaria quæ Sacrosanctis Ecclesiis in diversis speciebus de publico hactenus ministrata sunt, jubemus nunc quoque inconcussa, et à nullo prorsus imminuta præstari.
[2] Euseb. Vit. Const. lib. ii. c. 36. [3] Cod. Th. lib. v. tit. 3. de Bonis Clericor. leg. 1. Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 20.

poral estates as they pleased; and they fell to the Church only in case they died intestate. But the council of Agde[1] in France under Alaric, the Goth, Anno 506, went a little further, and decreed, "that every bishop, who had no children or nephews, should make the Church his heir, and no other;" as Caranza's edition, and Gratian, and some others read it. And the council of Sevil[2] made a like decree for the Spanish Churches; upon which Caranza[3] makes this remark, "that the canon was fit to be renewed in council, that the Church should be the bishop's heir, and not the Pope. And that it was against the mind of those fathers, that bishops should set up primogenitures, or enrich their kindred out of the revenues of the Church." Which reflection among other things might perhaps contribute towards his being brought into the Spanish Inquisition, though he was archbishop of Toledo; after which he underwent a ten years' imprisonment at Rome, and had some of his books prohibited in the Roman Index, of which Spondanus,[4] in his Annals, will give the reader a further account.—But I return to the primitive Church.

SECT. 10.—Sixthly, Heathen Temples and their Revenues sometimes given to the Church.

Where we may observe another addition made to the revenues of the clergy, by the donation of heathen temples, and sometimes the revenues, that were settled upon them. For though the greatest part of these went commonly to the emperor's coffers, or to favourites that begged them, upon the demolishing of the temples, as appears from the laws of Honorius and Gratian, and several others in the Theodosian Code,[5] yet some of them were given to the Church; for Honorius[6] takes notice of several orders and

---

[1] Con. Agathen. c. 24. al. 33. ap. Gratian. Caus. 12. Q. ii. c. 34. Episcopus qui filios aut nepotes non habuerit, alium quàm Ecclesiam non relinquat hæredem. [2] Con. Hispalens. i. c. 1. [3] Caranz. in loc. Hic canon erat renovandus in concilio, ut hæres defuncti Episcopi esset Ecclesia, non tamen Papa. Secundo alienum est à sententiâ horum Patrum licere Episcopo instituere primogenituras, vel locupletare consanguineos. See Bp. Burnet, Pref. to the Life of Bp. Bedel. p. 12. [4] Spondan. Annal. Eccl. an. 1559. n. 29. [5] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 10. de Paganis, leg. 19. et 20. [6] Ibid. leg. 20. Ea autem quæ multiplicibus constitutis ad venerabilem

decrees of his own, whereby such settlements had been made upon the Church, which were to continue the Church's property and patrimony for ever. And it is probable some other emperors might convert the revenues of the temples to the same use. At least the fabrics themselves, and the silver and golden statutes that were in them, were sometimes so disposed of. For Sozomen says,[1] the Μίθριον, or temple of the sun at Alexandria, was given to the Church by Constantius. And we learn from Socrates,[2] that in the time of Theodosius the statues of Serapis, and many other idols at Alexandria were melted down for the use of the Church; the emperor giving orders, that the gods should help to maintain the poor.

SECT. 11.—Seventhly, as also Heretical Conventicles and their Revenues.

Honorius made a like decree, Anno 412, in reference to all the revenues belonging to heretical conventicles, that both the churches or conventicles themselves, and all the lands,[3] that were settled upon them, should be forfeited, and become the possession and property of the Catholic Church, as by former decrees he had appointed. And I suppose, it was by virtue of these laws, that Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, shut up all the Novatian Churches, and seized upon all their revenues, and deprived Theonas, their bishop, of his substance; though Socrates[4] in telling the story represents the matter a little more invidiously, as if Cyril had done all this by his own private usurped authority and arbitrary power; which will hardly gain credit with any one, that considers, that those laws of Honorius were published before Cyril came to the episcopal throne, which was not till the year 412, when those laws were reinforced by the imperial power.

Ecclesiam voluimus pertinere, Christiana sibi meritò religio vindicavit, id est, vindicabit. Vid. Prosper. de Prædiction. par. 3. c. 38. Honorius templa omnia, cum suis adjacentibus spatiis, Ecclesiis contulit. [1] Sozomen. lib. v. c. 7. [2] Socrat. lib. v. c. 16. [3] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 5. de Hæret. leg. 52. Ecclesiis eorum vel conventiculis, prædiisque, siqua in eorum ecclesias hæreticorum, largitas prava contulit, proprietati potestatique catholicæ, sicut jamdudum statuimus, vindicatis. [4] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 7.

SECT. 12.—Eighthly, the Estates of Clerks, deserting the Church, to be forfeited to the Church.

While I am upon this head, it will not be improper to observe further, that by Justinian's laws,[1] if any clergymen or monks, who were possessed of temporal estates, forsook their church or monastery, and turned seculars again, all their substance was forfeited to the church or monastery, to which they belonged. These were the several methods, that were anciently taken for augmenting and improving the revenues of the Church, besides those of first-fruits and tithes, of which more hereafter.

SECT. 13.—No disreputable Ways of augmenting Church-Revenues encouraged. Fathers not to disinherit their Children to make the Church their Heirs.

But I must observe, that as these methods were generally reputed legal and allowable, so there were some other as generally disallowed and condemned. Particularly we find in St. Austin's time, that it was become a rule in the African Church, to receive no estates that were given to the Church to the great detriment and prejudice of the common rights of any others. As if a father disinherited his children to make the Church his heir, in that case no bishop would receive his donation. Possidius tells us[2] St. Austin refused some estates so given, because he thought it more just and equal, that they should be possessed by the children, or parents, or next kindred of the deceased persons. And that he did so, is evident from his own words in his discourse, *De Vita Clericorum*,[3] where he says, he had returned an estate to a son, which an angry father at his death had taken from him; and he thought he did well in it; professing for his own part, "that if any one disinherited his son, to make the Church his heir, he should seek some one else to receive his dona-

[1] Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 55. Si illi monasteria aut ecclesias relinquant, atque mundani fiant; omne ipsorum jus ad monasterium aut ecclesiam pertinet. Vid. Novel. v. c. 4. et 6. It Novel. 123. c. 42.

[2] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 24. [3] Aug. Serm, 49. de Diversis. tom. x. p. 520. Quando donavi filio, quod iratus pater moriens abstulit, bene feci. - - - Quid plura, fratres mei? quicunque vult exhæredato filio hæredem facere Ecclesiam, quærat alterum qui suscipiat, non Augustinum; immò, Deo propitio, neminem inveniat.

tion, and not Austin; and he hoped, by the grace of God, there would be none that would receive it." He adds in the same place[1] a very remarkable and laudable instance of great generosity and equity in Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, in a case of the like nature. A certain man having no children, nor hopes of any, gave away his whole estate to the Church, only reserving to himself the use of it for life. Now it happened afterwards, that he had children born to him; upon which the bishop generously returned him his estate, when he did not at all expect it. "The bishop indeed," says St. Austin, "had it in his power to have kept it, *sed jure fori, non jure poli,—only by the laws of man, but not by the laws of heaven;*" and therefore he thought himself obliged in conscience to return it. This shows how tender they were of augmenting the revenues of the Church by any methods, that might be thought unequitable, or such as were not reputable, honest, or of good report; herein observing the Apostle's rule, "to let their moderation,—τὸ ἐπιεικὲς, *their equity,*—be known to all men; not doing any hard thing for lucre's sake, nor taking advantages by rigour of law, when conscience and charity were against them."

SECT. 14.—Nothing to be demanded for Administering the Sacraments of the Church, nor for Consecrating Churches, nor Interment of the Dead.

To avoid scandal also, and to provide things honest in the sight of all men, they forbad any thing to be demanded for administering the sacraments of the Church. The council of Eliberis seems to intimate, that it was customary with some persons at their baptism to cast money into a basin by way of gratuity to the minister; but even this is there forbidden by a canon,[2] "least the priest should seem to sell what he freely received." Whence we may conclude, that, if the people might not offer, the priest might much less

[1] Aug. Serm. 49. de diversis tom. 10. p. 520. Quidam cùm filios non haberet, neque sperarat, res suas omnes, retento sibi usufructu, donavit Ecclesiæ. Nati sunt illi filii, et reddidit Episcopus nec opinanti quæ ille donaverat. In potestate habebat Episcopus non reddere; sed jure fori, non jure poli. [2] Con. Eliber. c. 48. Emendari placuit, ut hi qui baptizantur (ut fieri solebat) nummos in concham non mittant; ne sacerdos, quod gratis accepit, pretio distrahere videatur.

exact or demand any thing for administering the sacrament of baptism. In other Churches a voluntary oblation was allowed of, from persons that were able and willing to make it; but all exactions of that nature from the poor were still prohibited, for fear of discouraging them from offering themselves or their children to baptism. Thus it was in the Roman Church in the time of Gelasius, as we learn from his Epistles,[1] and in the Greek Church in the time of Gregory Nazianzen,[2] who takes occasion to answer this objection, which poor men made against coming immediately to baptism, because they had not wherewith to make the usual present, that was then to be offered, or to purchase the splendid robe, that was then to be worn, or to provide a treat for the minister that baptized them. He tells them, no such things would be expected or exacted of them;—"they need only make a present of themselves to Christ, and entertain the minister with their own good life and conversation, which would be more acceptable to him than any other offerings." This implies, that it was then the custom for the people to make a voluntary oblation at their baptism; but not the custom for ministers to demand it, as a matter of right, for fear of giving scandal. Some editions of Gratian,[3] and Vicecomes[4] allege a canon of the third or fourth council of Carthage to the same purpose; which, if the allegation were true, would prove that the same custom obtained in the African Church. But, as Antonius Augustinus,[5] and the Roman[6] correctors of Gratian have observed, there is no such canon to be found in any African council; but it is a canon of the second council of Bracara in Spain, which finding a corrupt practice crept in among the clergy, (notwithstanding the former prohibition of the Eliberitan council,) that ministers did exact pledges of the poor, who

---

[1] Gelas. Ep. i. al. 9. ad Episc. Lucaniæ. c. 7. Baptizandis consignandisque fidelibus pretia nulla Presbyteri præfigant, nec illationibus quibusdam impositis exagitare cupiant renascentes; quoniam quod gratis accipimus, gratis dare mandamur. Et ideò nihil à prædictis exigere moliantur, quo vel paupertate cogente deterriti, vel indignatione revocati, redemptionis suæ causas adire despiciant. [2] Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. t. i. p. 655. [3] Gratian. Caus. 1. Q. I. c. 103. [4] Vicecom. de Ritib. Bapt. lib. iv. c. 2. [5] Anton. Aug. de Emend. Gratiani. lib. i. dial. 14. [6] Gratian. Ibid. Edit. Rom. an. 1582.

had not ability to make any offering, endeavoured to redress this corruption, by passing a new order,[1] "that though voluntary oblations might be received, yet no pledge should be extorted from the poor, who were not able to offer; because many of the poor for fear of this kept back their children from baptism." The same council of Bracara made a decree,[2] "that no bishop should exact any thing as a due from any founders of Churches for their consecration; but, if any thing was voluntarily offered, he might receive it." And so in like manner for confirmation,[3] and administering the Eucharist,[4] all bishops and presbyters are strictly enjoined not to exact any thing of the receivers, because the grace of God was not to be set to sale, nor the sanctification of the spirit to be imparted for money. St. Jerom assures us further, "that it was not very honourable in his time to exact any thing for the burying places of the dead;" for he censures those that practised it,[5] as falling short of the merit of Ephron, the Hittite, whom Abraham forced to receive money for the burying-place, which he bought of him: "but now," says he, "there are some who sell burying-places, and take money for them, not by compulsion, as Ephron did, but by extortion rather from those that were unwilling to pay." By which we may understand, that in his time it was hardly allowable to demand any thing for the use of a public or private cemetry. Nor was this any part of the Church-revenues in those days, when as yet the custom of burying in Churches was not generally brought in, but was the practice of later ages; of which more, when we come to speak of the funeral rites of the Church.

---

[1] Con. Bracar. ii. c. 7. Edit. Crab. al. 3. Bracar. Ed. Labbe. Qui infantes suos ad baptismum offerunt, si quid voluntariè pro suo offerunt voto, suscipiatur ab eis; si verò per necessitatem paupertatis aliquid non habent quod offerant, nullum illis pignus violentèr tollatur à Clericis. Nam multi pauperes hoc timentes, filios suos à baptismo retrahunt. [2] Ibid. can. v.

[3] Gelas. Ep. I. ad 9. ad Episc. Lucan. c. 7. [4] Con. Trul. c. 23.

[5] Hieron. Quæst. Hebraic. in Gen. 23. tom. iii. p. 214. Postquam pretio victus est, ut sepulcrum venderet, &c. appellatus est Ephran: significante scripturâ, non eum fuisse consummatæ perfectæque virtutis, qui potuerit memorias vendere mortuorum. Sciant igitur qui sepulcra venditant, et non coguntur ut accipiant pretium, sed à nolentibus etiam extorquent, immutari nomen suum, et perire quid de merito eorum, &c.

SECT. 15.—The Oblations of the People anciently one of the most valuable Parts of Church-Revenues.

If any one is desirous to know, what part of the Church-revenues was anciently most serviceable and beneficial to the Church, he may be informed from St. Chrysostom and St. Austin, who give the greatest commendations to the offerings and oblations of the people, and seem to say, that the Church was never better provided, than when her maintenance was raised chiefly from them. For then men's zeal prompted them to be very liberal in their daily offerings; but as lands and possessions were settled upon the Church, this zeal sensibly abated; and so the Church came to be worse provided for, under the notion of growing richer. Which is the thing that St. Chrysostom complains of in his own times, when the ancient revenue arising from oblations was in a great measure sunk, and the Church with all her lands left in a worse condition than she was before. For now her ministers were forced to submit to secular cares, to the management of lands, and houses, and the business of buying and selling, for fear the orphans and virgins and widows of the Church should starve. He exhorts the people therefore to return to their ancient liberality of oblations; which would at once ease the ministry of all such cares, and make a good provision for the poor, and take off all the little scoffs and objections, that some were so ready to make and cast upon the clergy,—that they were too much given to secular cares and employments; when indeed it was not choice, but necessity that forced them to it. "There are," says he,[1] "in this place, (at Antioch he means,) by the grace of God an hundred thousand persons, that come to Church. Now, if every one of these would but give one loaf of bread daily to the poor, the poor would live in plenty. If every one would contribute but one halfpenny, no man would want; neither should we undergo so many reproaches and derisions, as if we were too intent upon our possessions." By this discourse of Chrysostom's it plainly appears, that he thought the oblations of the people in populous cities, when men acted with their pri-

[1] Chrys. Hom. 86. in Matth.

mitive zeal, was a better provision for the clergy, than even the lands and possessions of the Church. And St. Austin seems to have had the same sense of this matter. For Possidius tells us in his life,[1] "that when he found the possessions of the Church were become a little invidious, he was used to tell the laity, that he had rather live upon the oblations of the people of God, than undergo the care and trouble of those possessions; and that he was ready to part with them, provided all the servants and ministers of God might live as they did under the Old Testament, when, as we read, they that served at the altar were made partakers of the altar. But, though he made this proposal to the people, they would never accept of it." Which is an argument, that the people also thought, that the reducing the clergy's maintenance to the precise model of the Old Testament would have been a more chargeable way to them than the other; since the oblations of the Old Testament included tithes and first-fruits; concerning the state and original of which, as to what concerns the Christian Church, I come now to make a more particular inquiry.

CHAP. V.

Of Tithes and First-Fruits in particular.

SECT. 1.—Tithes anciently reckoned to be due by Divine Right.

CONCERNING tithes, so far as relates to the ancient Church, it will be proper to make three inquiries. First, whether the primitive fathers esteemed them to be due by divine right?—2dly, If they did, why they were not always strictly demanded?—3dly, In what age they were first generally settled upon the Church?—As to the first inquiry, it is generally agreed by learned men, that the ancients

[1] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 23. Dum fortè (ut adsolet) de possessionibus ipsis invidia Clericis fieret, alloquebatur plebem Dei, malle se ex collationibus plebis Dei vivere quàm illarum possessionum curam vel gubernationem pati; et paratum se illis cedere, ut eo modo omnes Dei servi et ministri viverent, quo in Veteri Testamento leguntur altari deservientes de eodem comparticipari. Sed nunquam id Laici suscipere voluerunt.

accounted tithes to be due by divine right. Bellarmin indeed,[1] and Rivet,[2] and Mr. Selden,[3] place them upon another foot. But our learned bishop Andrews[4] and bishop Carleton,[5] who wrote before Mr. Selden, and bishop Montague,[6] and Tillesly,[7] who wrote in answer to him, not to mention many others who have written since, have clearly proved, that the ancients believed the law about tithes not to be merely a ceremonial or political command, but of moral and perpetual obligation. It will be sufficient for me in this place to present the reader with two or three of their allegations. Origen, in one of his Homilies on Numbers, thus delivers his opinion about it:[8] "How does our righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, if they dare not taste of the fruits of the earth, before they offer the first-fruits to the priests, and separate the tithes for the Levites;—whilst I do nothing of this, but only so abuse the fruits of the earth, that neither the priest, nor the Levite, nor the altar of God shall see any of them?" St. Jerom says expressly,[9] "that the law about tithes and first-fruits was to be understood to continue in its full force in the Christian Church; where men were commanded not only to give tithes, but to sell all that they had, and give to the poor. But," says he, "if we will not proceed so far, let us at least imitate the Jewish practice, and give part of the whole to the poor, and the honour that is due to the priests and Levites. Which he who does not, defrauds

---

[1] Bellarmin. de Clericis, lib. i. c. 25. [2] Rivet. Exerc. 80. in Gen. xiv. p. 386. [3] Selden Hist. of Tithes, c. 4. [4] Andrew de Decimis, inter Opuscula. [5] Carleton, Divine Right of Tithes, c. 4. [6] Montague Diatribæ, &c. [7] Tillesly Answer to Selden. [8] Orig. Hom. 11. in Num. xviii. tom. i. p. 210. Quomodo ergò abundat justitia nostra plusquam Scribarum et Pharisæorum, si illi de fructibus terræ suæ gustare non audent, priusquam primitias suas Sacerdotibus offerant, et Levitis decimæ separentur? Et ego nihil horum faciens, fructibus terræ ita abutar, ut Sacerdos nesciat, Levites ignorent, Divinum Altare non sentiat? [9] Hieron. Com. in Mal. iii. Quod de decimis primitiisque diximus, quæ olim dabantur à populo Sacerdotibus ac Levitis, in Ecclesiæ quoque populis intelligite: quibus præceptum est, non solùm decimas dare et primitias, sed et vendere omnia quæ habent et dare pauperibus, et sequi Dominum Salvatorem. Quod si facere nolumus, saltem Judæorum imitemur exordia, ut pauperibus partem demus ex toto, et Sacerdotibus et Levitis honorem debitum deferamus. Quod qui non fecerit, Deum fraudare et supplantare convincitur, &c.

God, and makes himself liable to a curse." St. Austin as plainly favours the same opinion, telling men,[1] "that they ought to separate something out of their yearly fruits, or daily income; and that a tenth to a Christian was but a small proportion. Because it is said, the Pharisees gave tithes: 'I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess.' And our Lord saith, 'except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.' But if he, whose righteousness you are to exceed, gave tithes; and you give not a thousandth part; how can you be said to exceed him, whom you do not so much as equal?" By these few allegations the reader may be able to judge, what notion the ancients had of tithes, as due by divine right under the Gospel, as well as under the law; and that the precept concerning them was not a mere ceremonial or political command given to the Jews only.

Sect. 2.—Why not exacted in the Apostolical Age and those that immediately followed.

But why then, it may be said, were not tithes exacted by the Apostles at first, or by the fathers in the ages immediately following? for it is generally believed, that tithes were not the original maintenance of ministers under the Gospel. To this bishop Carleton has returned several very satisfactory answers, which the reader may take in his own words.[2] First, "That tithes were paid to the priests and Levites in the time of Christ and his Apostles: now the Synagogue must first be buried, before these things could be orderly brought into use in the Church." Secondly, "In the times of the New Testament, and somewhat after, there was an extraordinary maintenance by a community of all things, which supplied the want of tithes; but this commu-

[1] Aug. Com. in Psal. cxlvi. tom. viii. p. 698. Præcidite ergò aliquid, et deputate aliquid fixum vel ex annuis fructibus, vel ex quotidianis quæstibus vestris. - - - Decimas vis? Decimas exime, quanquam parum sit. Dictum est enim, quia Pharisæi decimas dabant, &c. Et quid ait Dominus? nisi abundaverit justitia vestra plusquam Scribarum et Pharisæorum, non intrabitis in regnum cœlorum. Et ille, super quem debet abundare justitia tua, decimas dat: tu autem nec millesimam das. Quomodo superabis eum, cui non æquaris?

[2] Carleton, Div. Right of Tithes. cap. iv. p. 21.

nity was extraordinary, and not to last always." Thirdly, "The use of paying tithes, as the Church then stood, was so incommodious, and cumbersome, that it could not well be practised. And therefore as circumcision was laid aside for a time, whilst Israel travelled through the wilderness, not because the people of right ought not then also to have used it, but because it was so incommodious for that estate and time of the Church, that it could not without great trouble be practised: even so the use of tithes in the time of Christ and his Apostles was laid aside, not because it ought not, but because it could not, without great encumbrance be done. And as circumcision was resumed, as soon as the estate of the Church could bear it; so tithes were re-established, as soon as the condition of the Church could suffer it. For tithes cannot well be paid, but where some whole state or kingdom receiveth Christianity, and where the magistrate doth favour the Church, which was not in the time of the Apostles." To these reasons some other learned persons have added a fourth, which is also worth noting,[1] "that the tithes of fruits were not so early paid to Christian priests, because the inhabitants of the country were the latest converts; whence also the name pagans stuck by the heathens, because the greatest relics of them were in country villages.

Sect. 3.—In what Age they were first generally settled upon the Church.

As to the last inquiry, when tithes began first to be generally settled upon the Church? the common opinion is, that it was in the fourth century, when magistrates began to favour the Church and the world was generally converted from heathenism. Some think Constantine settled them by law upon the Church; so Alsted,[2] who cites Hermannus Gigas for the same opinion. But there is no law of Constantine's now extant that makes express mention of any such thing. That, which comes the nearest to it, seems to be the law about an annual allowance of corn to the clergy in all cities, out of the public treasuries, which has been

---

[1] Bishop Fell Not. in Cypr. Ep. 66. al. 1.

[2] Alsted. Supplement. Chamier de Membris Eccles. c. 10.

spoken of in the last chapter; but this was not so much as a tenth of the yearly product; for the whole tribute itself, seems to have been no more. For in some laws of the Theodosian Code,[1] the emperor's tribute is called *Decimæ, tithes;* and the publicans, who collected it, are upon that account by Tully called *Decumani;*[2] and in Hesychius the word, Δεκατεύειν, *to tithe,* is explained by Τελωνεῖν *et* Δεκάτην εἰσπράττεσθαι, *to pay tribute,* or *pay their tithes* to the collectors of the tribute. Unless therefore we can suppose, that Constantine settled the whole tribute of the empire upon the Church, which it is evident he did not, we cannot take that law for a settlement of tithes upon the clergy. Yet it might be a step towards it; for before the end of the fourth century, as Mr. Selden[3] himself not only confesses, but proves out of Cassian, Eugippius, and others, tithes were paid to the Church. St. Austin lived in this age, and he says, tithes were paid before his time, and much better than they were in his own time; for he makes a great complaint of the non-payment of them. "Our forefathers," says he,[4] "abounded in all things, because they gave tithes to God, and tribute to Cæsar. But now, because our devotion to God is sunk, the taxes of the state are raised upon us. We would not give God his part in the tithes, and therefore the whole is taken away from us. The exchequer devours what we would not give to Christ." St. Chrysostom,[5] and the author of the Opus Imperfectum[6] on St. Matthew, that goes under his name, testify for the practice of other Churches about the same time. And it were easy to add a list of many other fathers and councils of the next age,[7] which speak of tithes as then actually settled upon the Church. But since they, who dispute most against

---

[1] Cod. Th. lib. x. tit. 19. de Metallis leg. 10 et 11. [2] Vid. Cicer. Orat. 3. in Ver. n. 21 et 22. [3] Selden Hist. of Tithes. c. v. p. 47, &c.
[4] Aug. Hom. 48. ex 50. tom. x. p. 201. Majores nostri, ideò copiis omnibus abundabant, quia Deo decimas dabant, et Cæsari censum reddebant. Modò autem quia decessit devotio Dei, accessit Indictio fisci. Nolumus partiri cum Deo Decimas, modò totum tollitur. Hoc tollit fiscus, quod non accipit Christus. [5] Chrys. Hom. 4. in Ephes. p. 1058. [6] Opus Imperf. in Mat. Hom. 44. Si Populus Decimas non obtulerit, murmurant omnes: At si peccantem Populum viderint, nemo murmurat contra eum. [7] Con. Aurelian. i. An. 511. can. 17. Con. Matiscon. 2, An. 588. c. v.

the divine right of them, do not deny this as to fact, it is needless to prosecute this matter any further; which they, that please, may see historically deduced through many centuries by Mr. Selden.[1]

SECT. 4.—The Original of First-fruits, and the Manner of Offering them.

There is one part more of Church-revenues, whose original remains to be inquired into, and that is first-fruits, which are frequently mentioned in the primitive writers. For not only those called the Apostolical Canons,[2] and Constitutions,[3] speak of them, as part of the maintenance of the clergy; but writers more ancient and more authentic, as Origen and Irenæus, mention them also as oblations made to God. "Celsus," says Origen,[4] "would have us dedicate first-fruits to dæmons; but we dedicate them to him, who said, 'Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind.' To whom we give our first-fruits, to him also we send up our prayers, having a great high-priest that is entered into heaven, &c." In like manner Irenæus says,[5] "Christ taught his disciples to offer the first-fruits of the creatures to God, and that this was the Church's continual oblation with thanksgiving for the emjoyment of all the rest." Which implies, either that they had a particular form of thanksgiving, as there is in both the Greek and Latin Rituals; or else, that these first-fruits were offered with other oblations at the time of the eucharist. However this be, it is evident, that as they were principally designed for agnizing the Creator, so they were secondarily intended for the use of his servants; and therefore we find the Eustathian heretics censured by the synod of Gangra,[6] Anno 324, "for that they took the first-fruits, which were anciently given to the Church, and divided them among the saints of their own

---

[1] Selden Hist. of Tithes. c. 5. &c. [2] Canon. Apost. c. 4.
[3] Constit. lib. ii. c. 25. lib. viii. c. 30. [4] Orig. cont. Cels. lib. viii. p. 400. [5] Iren. lib. iv. c. 32. Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, &c. Ibid. c. 34. Offerre igitur oportet Deo primitias ejus creaturæ, &c. [6] Con. Gangr. in Præfat. Καρποφορίας τε τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς τὰς ἀνέκαθεν διδομένας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἑαυτοῖς ὡς τοῖς σὺν αὐτοῖς, ὡς ἁγίοις, τὰς διαδόσεις ποιούμενοι.

party," in opposition to which practice there are two canons made by that council,[1] forbidding any one to receive, or distribute such oblations out of the Church, otherwise than by the directions of the bishop, under pain of excommunication. Some other rules are also given by one of the councils of Carthage,[2] inserted into the African Code, concerning these first-fruits, that they should be only of grapes and corn; which shows that it was also the practice of the African Church. Nazianzen[3] likewise mentions, "the first fruits of the wine-press and the floor, which were to be dedicated to God." And the author of the Constitutions has a form of prayer,[4] Ἐπίκλησις ἐπὶ ἀπαρχῶν, *an invocation upon the first-fruits*, to be used at their dedication. So that it seems very clear, that the offering of first-fruits was a very ancient and general custom in the Christian Church, and that this also contributed something toward the maintenance of the clergy; whose revenues I have now considered so far as concerns the several kinds and first original of them.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Management and Distribution of the Revenues of the Ancient Clergy.

SECT. I.—The Revenues of the whole Diocese anciently in the Hands of the Bishop.

THE next thing to be considered is the ancient way of managing and distributing these revenues among the clergy, and such others, as were dependants upon the Church. Which being a little different from the way of later ages, since settlements were made upon parochial Churches, for the right understanding of it we are in the first place to observe, that anciently the revenues of the whole diocese were all in the hands of the bishop; who, with the advice and consent of his senate of presbyters, distributed them as

[1] Con. Gangr. in Præfat. can. 7 et 8. Con. African, c. 4.
[2] Cod. Can. Afr. c. 37. al. 40.
[3] Naz. Ep. 80.
[4] Constit. lib. viii. c. 40.

the occasions of the Church required. This will appear evident to any one, that will consider these two things, which will hereafter be proved, when we come to speak of parochial Churches and their original. First, that there were anciently no presbyters or other clergy fixed upon particular Churches, or congregations in the same city or diocese; but they were served indifferently by any presbyter from the *Ecclesia Matrix, the mother* or *cathedral Church*, to which all the clergy of the city or diocese belonged, and not to any particular congregation. Secondly, that when presbyters were fixed to particular Churches or assemblies in some cities, yet still those Churches had no separate revenues; but the maintenance of the clergy officiating in them was from the common stock of the mother-church, into which all the oblations of particular Churches were put, as into a common fund, that from thence there might be made a general distribution. That thus it was at Constantinople till the middle of the fifth century, is evident from what we find in Theodorus Lector,[1] who says, "that Marcian, the *Œconomus*, or *guardian* of that Church, under Gennadius, Anno 460, was the first that ordered the clergy of every particular Church to receive the offerings of their own Church, whereas before the great Church received them all.

SECT. 2.—And by his Care distributed among the Clergy.

Now this being the ancient custom, it gives us a clear account how all the revenues of the Church came to be in the hands of the bishop, and how it was made one part of his office and duty by the canons to concern himself in the care and distribution of them. Of which because I have already spoken elsewhere,[2] I shall say no more in this place, save only that the bishop himself, to avoid suspicion and prevent mismanagement, was obliged to give an account of his administration in a provincial synod;[3] as also at his election to exhibit a list of his own goods and estate, that such things as belonged to him[4] might be distinguished

[1] Theod. Lect. lib. i. p. 558. [2] Book ii. chap. iv. sect. 6.
[3] Con. Antioch. c. 25. [4] Canon. Apost. c. 30. al. 40

from those, that belonged to God and the Church. And for the same reason the great council of Chalcedon ordered,[1] "that every bishop should have an *Œconomus*, or *guardian* of the Church, and he to be chosen by the vote of all the clergy, as has been noted in another place. See book iii. chap. xii. sect. 4.

SECT. 3.—Rules about the Division of Church-Revenues.

As to the distribution itself, in the most primitive ages we find no certain rules about it; but as it was in the Apostles' days, so it continued for some time after: what was collected, was usually deposited with the bishop, and distribution was made to every man according as he had need. But the following ages brought the matter to some certain rules, and then the revenues were divided into certain portions, monthly or yearly, according as occasion required, and these proportioned to the state or needs of every order. In the western Church the division was usually into three or four parts; whereof one fell to the bishop, a second to the rest of the clergy, a third to the poor, and the fourth was applied to the maintenance of the fabric and other necessary uses of the Church. The council of Bracara[2] makes but three parts; one for the bishop, another for the clergy, and the third for the fabric and lights of the Church. But then it was supposed, that the bishop's hospitality should out of such a proportion provide for the necessities of the poor. By other rules the poor,[3] that is, all distressed people, the virgins and widows of the Church, together with the martyrs and confessors in prison, the sick and strangers, have one-fourth in the dividend expressly allotted them. For all these had relief, though not a perfect maintenance, from the charity of the Church. At Rome there were fifteen hundred such persons besides the clergy pro-

[1] Con. Chalced. c. 25. [2] Con. Bracar. i. c. 25. Placuit, ut de rebus ecclesiasticis fiant tres æquæ portiones, id est, una Episcopi, alia Clericorum, tertia in reparatione vel in luminariis Ecclesiæ. [3] Gelas. Ep. 1. al. 9. ad Episc. Lucaniæ. c. 29. Quatuor tam de redditu quàm de oblatione Fidelium - - - convenit fieri portiones. quarum sit una Pontificis, altera Clericorum, tertia Pauperum, quarta fabricis applicanda. Vid. Simplicii. Ep. 3. ad Florent. Gregor. Magn. lib. iii. Ep. 11.

vided for in this way in the time of Cornelius;[1] and above three thousand at Antioch in the time of Chrysostom:[2] by which we may make an estimate of the revenues and charities of those populous Churches.

SECT. 4.—In some Churches the Clergy lived all in Common.

In some Churches they made no such division, but lived all in common, the clergy with the bishop, as it were in one mansion, and at one table. But this they did not by any general canon, but only upon choice, or particular combination and agreement in some particular Churches. As Sozomen[3] notes it to have been the custom at Rinocurura in Egypt, and Possidius affirms[4] the same of the Church of St. Austin. What was the practice of St Austin and his clergy we cannot better learn than from St. Austin himself, who tells us,[5] "that all his clergy laid themselves voluntarily under an obligation to have all things in common; and therefore none of them could have any property, or any thing to dispose of by will; or if they had, they were liable to be turned out, and have their names expunged out of the roll of the clergy: which he resolved to do, though they appealed to Rome, or to a thousand councils against him; by the help of God they should not be clerks, where he was bishop." For his own part, he tells us,[6] he was so punctual to this rule, "that if any one presented him with a robe finer than ordinary, he was used to sell it; that since his clergy could not wear the same in kind, they might at least partake of the benefit, when it was sold and made common." But as this way of living would not comport with the state of all Churches, so there were but few that

---

[1] Cornel. Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. [2] Chrys. Hom. 67. in Matth. [3] Sozom. lib. vi. c. 31. [4] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 25. [5] Aug. Serm. 50. de Diversis, sive de Communi Vitâ Clericorum, tom. x. p. 523. Quia placuit illis socialis hæc vita, quisquis cum hypocrisi vixerit, quisquis inventus fuerit habens proprium, non illi permitto ut inde faciat testamentum, sed delebo eum de tabulâ Clericorum, interpellet contra me mille concilia, naviget contra me quo voluerit, sit certè ubi potuerit, adjuvabit me Deus, ut ubi ego Episcopus sum, illic Clericus esse non possit. [6] Ibid. Si quis meliorem dederit, vendo, quod et facere soleo, ut quandò non potest vestis esse communis, pretium vestis sit commune.

embraced it; and those that did, were not compelled to it by any general law, but only by local statutes of their own appointment.

SECT. 5.—Alterations made in these Matters by the Endowment of Parochial Churches.

Yet in one of these two ways the clergy were commonly provided for out of the revenues of the great Church, till such times as endowments and settlements began to be made upon parochial Churches; which was not done in all places at the same time, nor in one and the same way. But it seems to have had its rise from particular founders of Churches, who settled *Manse* and glebe upon the Churches, which they builded, and upon that score were allowed a right of patronage, to present their own clerk, and invest him with the revenues of the Church, wherewith they had endowed it. This practice was begun in the time of Justinian, Anno 500, if not before, for there are two of his laws, which authorize and confirm it.[1] About the same time a settlement of other revenues, as oblations, &c. was also made in some places upon parochial Churches, as has been observed before out of Theodorus Lector's accounts of the Churches of Constantinople. Yet the change is thought by some[2] to be much later in England. For they collect out of Bede,[3] that the ancient course of the clergy's officiating only *pro tempore* in parochial Churches, whilst they received maintenance from the cathedral Church, continued in England more than an hundred years after the coming of Austin into England, that is, till about the year 700. For Bede plainly intimates, that at that time the bishop and his clergy lived together, and had all things common, as they had in the primitive Church in the days of the Apostles.

SECT. 6.—No Alienations to be made of Church Revenues or Goods, but upon Extraordinary Occasions.

I have but one thing more to observe upon this head, which is, that such goods or revenues, as were once given

[1] Justin. Novel. 57. c. 2. Novel. 123. c. 18. [2] Cawdrey Disc. of Patronage, c. ii. p. 8. Selden of Tithes, c. ix. p. 255. [3] Bede. Hist. Gentis Anglor. lib. iv. c. 27.

to the Church, were always esteemed devoted to God; and therefore were only to be employed in his service, and not to be diverted to any other use, except some extraordinary case of charity absolutely required it. As if it was to redeem captives, or relieve the poor in time of famine, when no other succours could be afforded them; in that case it was usual to sell even the sacred vessels and utensils of the Church, to make provision for the living temples of God, which were to be preferred before the ornaments of the material buildings. Thus St. Ambrose melted down the communion-plate of the Church of Milan to redeem some captives, which otherwise must have continued in slavery; and, when the Arians objected this to him invidiously as a crime, he wrote a most elegant apology and vindication for himself, where among other things, worthy the reader's perusal, he pleads his own cause after this manner;[1] "Is it not better that the bishop should melt the plate to sustain the poor, when other sustenance cannot be had, than that some sacrilegious enemy should carry it off by spoil and plunder? Will not our Lord expostulate with us upon this account? Why did you suffer so many helpless persons to die with famine, when you had gold to provide them sustenance? Why were so many captives carried away and sold without redemption? Why were so many suffered to be slain by the enemy? It had been better to have preserved the vessels of living men, than lifeless metals. What answer can be returned to this? For what shall a man say? I was afraid lest the temple of God should want its ornaments. But Christ will answer; my sacraments do not require gold, nor please me the more for being ministered in gold, which are not bought with gold. The ornament of my sacraments is the redemption of captives; and those are truly precious vessels, which redeem souls from death." Thus that holy father goes on to justify the fact, which the Arians called sacrilege, but he, by a truer name, charity and mercy; for the sake of which he concludes it was no crime for a man to break, to melt, to sell the mystical vessels of the Church, though it were a

[1] Ambros. de Offic. lib. ii. c. 28.

very great offence for any man to convert them to his own private use. After the same example we find St. Austin[1] disposed of the plate of his Church for the redemption of captives. Acacius, bishop of Amida, did the same for the redemption of seven thousand Persian slaves from the hands of the Roman soldiers, as Socrates informs us.[2] From whence we also learn, that in such cases they did not consider what religion men were of, but only whether they were indigent and necessitous men, and such as stood in need of their assistance. We have the like instances in the practice of Cyril of Jerusalem, mentioned by Theodoret[3] and Sozomen, and in Deogratias, bishop of Carthage, whose charity is extolled by Victor Uticensis[4] upon the same occasion. For he sold the communion-plate to redeem the Roman soldiers, that were taken captives in their wars with the Vandals. This was so far from being esteemed sacrilege or unjust alienation, that the laws against sacrilege excepted this case, though they did no other whatsoever; as may be seen in the law of Justinian,[5] which forbids the selling or pawning the church-plate, or vestments, or any other gifts, except in case of captivity or famine, to redeem slaves, or relieve the poor; because in such cases the lives or souls of men were to be preferred before any vessels or vestments whatsoever. The poverty of the clergy was a pitiable case of the same nature; and therefore if the annual income of the Church would not maintain them, and there was no other way to provide them of necessaries; in that case some canons[6] allowed the bishop to alienate or sell certain goods of the Church, to raise a present maintenance.

---

[1] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 24. Vid. Cave. Hist. Liter. [2] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 21. [3] Theod. lib. ii. c. 27. Sozom. lib. iv. c. 25. [4] Victor. de Persec. Vandal. lib. i. Bibl. Patr. tom. vii. p. 591. [5] Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 2. de Sacrosanct. Eccles. leg. 21. Sancimus, nemini licere sacratissima atque arcana vasa, vel vestes, cæteraque donaria, quæ ad divinam religionem necessaria sunt - - - vel ad venditionem vel ad hypothecam vel ad pignus trahere - - - exceptâ causâ captivitatis et famis in locis quibus hoc contigerit. Nam si necessitas fuerit in redemptione captivorum, tunc et venditionem præfatarum rerum divinarum, et hypothecam et pignorationes fieri concedimus; quoniam non absurdum est, animas hominum quibuscunque vasis vel vestimentis præferri. [6] Con. Carthag. v. c. 4. Con. Agathen. c. 7.

SECT. 7.—And that with the joint Consent of the Bishop and his Clergy, with the Approbation of the Metropolitan or some Provincial Bishops.

But that no fraud might be committed in any such cases, the same canons did specially provide, "that when any urgent necessity compelled the bishop to take this extraordinary course, he should first consult his clergy, and also the metropolitan, and others his comprovincial bishops, that they might judge of the necessity, and whether it were a reasonable ground for such a proceeding." The fourth council of Carthage[1] disannuls all such acts of the bishop, whereby he either gives away, or sells, or commutes any goods of the Church, without the consent and subscription of his clergy. And the fifth council of Carthage[2] requires him to intimate the case and necessity of his Church first to the primate of the province, that he with a certain number of bishops may judge, whether it be fitting to be done. The council of Agde says,[3] "he should first consult two or three of his neighbouring bishops, and take their approbation." Thus stood the laws of the Church, so long as the bishop and his clergy had a common right in the dividend of ecclesiastical revenues; nothing could be alienated without the consent of both parties, and the cognizance and ratification of the metropolitan or provincial synod. So that the utmost precaution was taken in this affair, lest, under the pretence of necessity or charity, any spoil or devastation should be made of the goods and revenues of the Church.

---

[1] Con. Carth. iv. c. 32. Irrita erit donatio Episcorum, vel venditio vel commutatio rei ecclesiasticæ, absque conniventiâ et subscriptione Clericorum.
[2] Con. Carth. v. c. 4. Si aliqua necessitas cogit, hanc insinuandam esse Primati provinciæ ipsius, ut cum statuto numero Episcoporum, utrum faciendum sit, arbitretur. [3] Con. Agathen. c. 7. Apud duos vel tres comprovinciales vel vicinos Episcopos, causâ, quâ necesse sit vendi, primitùs comprobetur.

BOOK VI.

AN ACCOUNT OF SEVERAL LAWS AND RULES, RELATING TO THE EMPLOYMENT, LIFE, AND CONVERSATION OF THE PRIMITIVE CLERGY.

CHAP. I.

Of the Excellency of these Rules in general, and the Exemplariness of the Clergy in Conforming to them.

SECT. 1.—The Excellency of the Christian Rules attested and envied by the Heathens.

I HAVE in the two foregoing books given an account of the great care of the primitive Church in providing and training up fit persons for the ministry, and of the great encouragements that were given them by the state, as well to honour and distinguish their calling, as to excite and provoke them to be sedulous in the discharge of their several offices and functions. There is one thing more remains, which is, to give an account also of the Church's care in making necessary laws and canons, obliging every member of the ecclesiastic body to live conformably to his profession, and exercise himself in the duties of his station and calling. These rules were many of them so excellent in their own nature, and so strictly and carefully observed by those, who had a concern in them, that some of the chief adversaries of the Christian religion could not but take notice of them, and with a sort of envy and emulation bear testimony to them. Among the works of Julian there is a famous epistle of his to Arsacius, high-priest of Galatia, which is recorded also by Sozomen,[1] wherein he takes

---

[1] Sozom. lib. v. c. 16.

occasion to tell him, "that it was very visible, that the causes of the great increase of Christianity were chiefly their professed hospitality towards strangers, and their great care in burying the dead, joined with a pretended sanctity and holiness of life." Therefore he bids him, as high-priest of Galatia, to take care, "that all the priests of that region, that were under him, should be made to answer the same character;—and that he should either by his threatenings or persuasions bring them to be diligent and sober men, or else remove them from the office of priesthood;—that he should admonish the priests, neither to appear at the theatre, nor frequent the tavern, nor follow any calling or employment, that was dishonourable and scandalous; and such as were observant of his directions he should honour and promote them, but discard and expel the refractory and contumacious." This is plainly to say, and it is so much the more remarkable for its coming from the mouth of an adversary, that the Christian clergy of those times were men that lived by excellent rules, diligent in their employment, grave and sober in their deportment, charitable to the indigent, and cautious and reserved in their whole conversation and behaviour toward all men. Which as it tended mightily to propagate and advance Christianity in the world; so it was what Julian upon that account could not but look upon with an envious eye, and desire that his idol-priests might gain the same character; thereby to eclipse the envied reputation of the other, and reflect honour and lustre upon his beloved heathen religion. We have the like testimonies in Ammianus Marcellinus[1] and others, concerning the frugality, temperance, modesty, and humility of Christian bishops in their own times; which coming from the pens of professed heathens, and such as did neither spare the emperors themselves, nor the bishops of Rome, who lived in greater state and affluence, may well be thought authentic relations, and just accounts of those holy men, whose commendations and characters, so ample, nothing but truth could have extorted from the adversaries of their religion.

[1] Ammian. Marcel. lib. xxvii.

SECT. 2.—The Character of the Clergy from Christian Writers.

This being so, we may the more easily give credit to those noble panegyrics and encomiums, which some ancient Christian writers make upon the clergy, and their virtues, and discipline in general. Origen says,[1] "it was the business of their life to traverse every corner of the world, and make converts and proselytes to godliness both in cities and villages. And they were so far from making a gain hereof, that many of them took nothing for their service; and those, that did, took only what was necessary for their present subsistence, though there wanted not persons enough, who in their liberality were ready to have communicated much more to them." St. Austin[2] gives the like good character of the bishops and presbyters of his own time, making them the chief ornament of the Catholic Church, and extolling their virtues above those of a monastic life, because their province was more difficult, having to converse with all sorts of men, and being forced to bear with their distempers in order to cure them. He, that would see more of this general character, must consult the ancient Apologists, where he will find it interwoven with the character of Christians in general; whose innocence, and patience, and charity, and universal goodness, was owing partly to the institutions, and partly to the provoking examples of their guides and leaders; who lived as they spake, and first trod the path themselves, which they required others to walk in. Which was the thing, that set the Christian teachers so much above the philosophers of the Gentiles. For the philosophers indeed discoursed and wrote very finely about virtue in the theory, but they undid all they said in their own practice. "Their discourses," as Minucius observes,[3] "were only eloquent harangues against their own vices; whereas the Christian philosophers expressed their profession not in their words or habit, but in the real virtues of the soul; they did not talk great, but live well; and so attained to that glory, which the philosophers pretended always to be offering at, but could never happily

[1] Origen. Cont. Cels. lib. iii. p. 116. [2] Aug. de Moribus Eccles. Cathol. c. 32. tom. i. p. 330. [3] Minuc. Octav. p. 110.

arrive to." Lactantius[1] triumphs over the gentile philosophers upon the same topic; and so Gregory Nazianzen,[2] Tertullian,[3] Cyprian,[4] and many others; whose arguments had been easily retorted, had not the Christian teachers been generally men of a better character, and free from those imputations, which they cast upon the adverse party.

Sect. 3.—Particular Exceptions no Derogation to their general good Character.

Some few instances indeed, it cannot be denied, are to be found of persons, who in these best ages were scandals and reproaches to their profession. The complaints, that are made by good men, will not suffer us to believe otherwise. Cyprian[5] and Eusebius[6] lament the vices of some among the clergy, as well as laity, and reckon them among the causes, that moved the divine providence to send those two great fiery trials upon the Church, the Decian and the Diocletian persecutions; thereby to purge the tares from the wheat, and correct those enormities and abuses, which the ordinary remedy of ecclesiastical discipline, through the iniquity of the times, was not able to redress. The like complaints are made by Chrysostom,[7] Gregory Nazianzen,[8] and St. Jerom,[9] of some ecclesiastics in their own times, whose practices were corrupt, and dishonourable to their profession. And indeed it were a wonder, if all ages should not afford some such instances of unsound members in so great a body of men, since there was a Judas even among the Apostles. But then it is to be considered, that a few such exceptions did not derogate from the good character, which the primitive clergy did generally deserve; and the faults of those very men were the occasion of many good laws and rules of discipline, which the provincial synods of those times enacted; out of which I have chiefly collected the following account, which concerns the lives and labours of the ancient clergy.

---

[1] Lact. lib. iv. c. 23. Lib. iii. c. 15. [2] Naz. Invect. i. in Julian. [3] Tertul. Apol. c. 46. [4] Cypr. de Bono Patient. p. 210 [5] Cypr. de Lapsis, p. 124. [6] Euseb. lib. viii. c. 1. [7] Chrys. Hom. 30. in Act. [8] Naz. Carm. Cygn. de Episcopis, tom. ii. [9] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian.

SECT. 4.—An Account of some ancient Writers which treat of the Duties of the Clergy.

To these the reader may join those excellent tracts of the Ancients, which purposely handle this subject; such as St. Chrysostom's Six Books *De Sacerdotio;* St. Jerom's Second Epistle to Nepotian, which is called, *De Vitâ Clericorum;* and Gregory Nazianzen's Apology for flying from the priesthood; in all which the duties of the clergy are excellently described. Or if any one desires rather to see them exemplified in some living instances and great patterns of perfection, which commonly make deeper impressions than bare rules, he must consult those excellent characters of the most eminent primitive bishops, which are drawn to the life by the best pens of the age; such as the Life of Ignatius by Chrysostom; the Life of St. Basil and Athanasius by Gregory Nazienzen; the Life of St. Austin by Possidius; the Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus and Meletius by Gregory Nyssen; in all which the true character and idea of a Christian bishop is set forth and described with this advantage,—that a man does not barely read of rules, but see them as it were exemplified in practice. The chief of these discourses in both kinds are already translated into our own language by other pens,[1] and they are too prolix to be inserted into a discourse of this nature, which proceeds in a different method from them. I shall therefore only extract such observations from them, as fall in with the public and general laws of the Church, of which I give an account in the following chapters, and leave the rest to the curious diligence of the inquisitive reader.

---

[1] See Bishop Burnet's Pastoral Care, c. 4; and Seller's Remarks on the Lives of the Primitive Fathers.

CHAP. II.

Of Laws relating to the Life and Conversation of the Primitive Clergy.

SECT. I.—Exemplary Purity required in the Clergy above other Men, Reasons for it.

THE laws of the Church, which concerned the clergy, I shall, for distinction's sake, consider under three heads; speaking, first, Of such laws as concerned their life and conversation. Secondly, Of such as more particularly related to the exercise of the several offices and duties of their function. Thirdly, Of such as were a sort of out-guards or fences to both the former. The laws, which related to their life and conversation, were such as tended to create in them a sublimity of virtue above other men; forasmuch as they were to be examples and patterns to them, which, if good, would be both a light and a spur to others, but if bad, the very pests and banes of the Church. It is Gregory Nazianzen's reflection[1] upon the different sorts of guides, which he had observed then in the Church. "Some," he complains, "did, with unwashed hands and profane minds, press to handle the holy mysteries, and affect to be at the altar, before they were fit to be initiated to any sacred service; they looked upon the holy order and function, not as designed for an example of virtue, but only as a way of subsisting themselves; not as a trust, of which they were to give an account, but a state of absolute authority and exemption. And these men's examples corrupted the people's morals, faster than any cloth can imbibe a colour, or a plague infect the air; since men were more disposed to receive the tincture of vice than virtue from the example of their rulers." In opposition to such he lays down this as the first thing to be aimed at by all spiritual physicians, "that they should draw the picture of all manner of virtues in their own lives, and set themselves as examples to the people; that it might

[1] Naz. Orat. I. Apologet. de Fuga. tom. i. p. 5.

not be proverbially said of them,—that they set about curing others, while they themselves were full of sores and ulcers." Nor were they to draw this image of virtue slightly and to a faint degree, but accurately and to the highest perfection; since nothing less, than such degrees and measures of virtue, was expected by God from the rulers and governors of his people: and then there would be hopes, that such heights and eminencies would draw the multitude at least to a mediocrity in virtue, and allure them to embrace that voluntarily by gentle persuasions, which they would not be brought to, so effectually and lastingly, by force and compulsion. He urges further[1] the necessity of such a purity from the consideration of the sacredness and majesty of the function itself. "A minister's office sets him in the same rank and order with angels themselves; he celebrates God with archangels; transmits the Church's sacrifices to the altar in heaven, and performs the priest's office with Christ himself; he reforms the work of God's hands, and presents the image to his maker; his workmanship is for the world above; and therefore he should be exalted to a divine and heavenly nature, whose business is to be as a God himself, and make others gods also." St. Chrysostom makes use of the same argument,[2] "that the priesthood, though it be exercised upon earth, is occupied wholly about heavenly things; that it is the ministry of angels put by the Holy Ghost into the hands of mortal men; and therefore a priest ought to be pure and holy, as being placed in heaven itself, in the midst of those heavenly powers." He presses likewise the danger and prevalency of a bad example.[3] "Subjects commonly form their manners by the pattern of their princes. How then should a proud man be able to assuage the swelling tumours of others? or an angry ruler hope to make his people in love with moderation and meekness? Bishops are exposed, like combatants in the theatre, to the view and observation of all men; and their faults, though never so small, cannot be hid; and therefore, as their virtuous actions profit many by provoking them to the like

---

[1] Naz. Orat. I. Apologet. de Fuga. tom. i. p. 31. [2] Chrys. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. c. 4. [3] Ibid. lib. iii. c. 14.

zeal, so their vices will render others unfit to attempt or prosecute any thing that is noble and good. For which reason their souls ought to shine all over with the purest brightness, that they may both enlighten and extimulate the souls of others, who have their eyes upon them. A priest should arm himself all over with purity of life, as with adamantine armour; for if he leave any part naked and unguarded, he is surrounded both with open enemies and pretended friends, who will be ready to wound and supplant him. So long as his life is all of a piece, he needs not fear their assaults; but if he be overseen in a fault, though but a small one, it will be laid hold of and improved to the prejudice of all his former virtues. For all men are most severe judges in his case, and treat him not with any allowance for being encompassed with flesh, or as having an human nature; but expect he should be an angel, and free from all infirmities." "He cannot, indeed," as the same father argues in another place,[1] "with any tolerable decency and freedom discharge his office in punishing and reproving others, unless he himself be blameless and without rebuke. "The priest's office is a more difficult province[2] than that of leading an army, or governing a kingdom, and requires an angelical virtue. His soul ought to be purer than the rays of the sun, that the Holy Spirit may never leave him desolate; but that he may be always able to say, 'I live, yet not I, but Christ that liveth in me." He there goes on to draw the comparison[3] at large between the clerical and the monastic life, and shows how much more difficult it is to take care of a multitude of men immersed in secular business, than of a single person, that lives retired and free from temptation. And upon the whole matter he concludes,[4] "that as God requires greater purity in those that serve at his altar, so he will exact a more ample account of them, and more severely punish their offences." By these and many other such like arguments did those holy fathers try to raise both in themselves and others a just sense of that universal purity, which becomes the sacred function.

---

[1] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. v. c. 3. [2] Chrys. Ibid. lib. vi. c. 2.
[3] Ibid. lib. vi. c. 3. [4] Ibid. lib. vi. c. 10 et 11.

SECT. 2.—Church-Censures more severe against them than any others.

And to the strength of these arguments the Church added the authority of her sanctions; inflicting severer penalties upon offending clergymen than any others. For whereas all other offenders were allowed, by the benefit of public penance, to regain the privileges of their order, this favour was commonly denied by the Church to such of her sons among the clergy, as were notorious for any scandalous crimes, whereby they became a reproach to their profession. For such delinquents were usually deposed from their office, and sometimes excommunicated also, and obliged to do penance among the laymen; but with this difference, that though repentance would restore them to the peace of the Church, yet it would not qualify them to act in their office and station again; but they must be content thenceforth to communicate only as laymen. Some canons indeed did not oblige them to do public penance in the Church, because they thought it punishment enough to degrade them; others required them to submit to that part of discipline also. But still the result and consequence of both was the same, that such persons for ever after were only to be treated in the quality of laymen. Those called the Apostolical Canons are sometimes for the former way; for one of them says,[1] "if a bishop, presbyter, or deacon is taken in fornication, perjury, or theft, he shall be deposed, but not excommunicated; for the Scripture saith, "thou shalt not punish twice for the same crime." I do not now stand to inquire, whether there be any such Scripture as these canons refer to, but only observe what was the practice of the Greek Church when these canons were made, which is also taken notice of in St. Basil's Canons,[2] and those of Peter of Alexandria,[3] and some others, which show it to have been the customary practice of their Churches. Yet for simony[4] and some other crimes,[5] the same Apostolical Canons order both deposition and excommunication. And in the African Church both punishments were inflicted

[1] Canon. Apost. c. 25. [2] Basil. Ep. Canon. c. 3, 32, 51. [3] Pet. Alex. Ep. Canon. c. 10. ap. Beveneg. Pandect. tom. ii. [4] Canon. Apost. c. 29. [5] Ibid. c. 30 et 51.

also for one and the same crime, in the time of Cyprian, as appears from his Epistle to Cornelius,[1] where speaking of Novatus, who was guilty of murder in causing his own wife by a blow to miscarry, he says, "for this crime he was not only to be degraded, or expelled the presbytery, but to be deprived of the communion of the Church also." From whence we may collect the severity of the ancient canons against such crimes of the clergy in general, as were committed to the flagrant scandal of the Church.

SECT. 3.—What Crimes punished with Degradation: viz. Theft, Murder, Perjury, &c.

Hence also we may observe in particular, what sort of crimes were thought worthy to be punished with degradation, namely, such as theft, murder, perjury, fraud, sacrilege, fornication, and adultery, and such like gross and scandalous offences. For in this case they distinguished between *Peccatum* and *Crimen, little faults* and *crimes of a more heinous nature.* For St. Austin observes,[2] "it was not all manner of failings that hindered men's ordination at first; for if the Apostle had required, as a qualification in persons to be ordained, that they should be without sin, all men must have been rejected, and none ordained, since no man lives without sin; but he only requires, that they should be blameless in respect to criminal and scandalous offences." And this was the rule the Church observed in canvassing the lives of her clergy after ordination, when they were actually engaged in her service. It was not every lesser failing or infirmity that was punished with degradation; but only crimes of a deeper dye, such as theft, murder, fraud, perjury, sacrilege, fornication, and adultery. Concerning the last of which there are these two things further observable in some of the ancient canons. 1st, That, if any clergyman's wife was convicted of adultery, he himself was

[1] Cypr. Ep. 49. al. 52. p. 97. Propter hoc se non de presbyterio tantum, sed et communicatione prohiberi pro certo tenebat, &c. [2] Aug. Tract. 41. in Joh. tom. ix. p. 126. Apostolus Paulus, quandò elegit ordinandos vel Presbyteros vel Diaconos, et quicunque ordinandus est ad præposituram Ecclesiæ, non ait, "Si quis sine peccato est;" hoc enim si diceret, omnis homo reprobaretur, nullus ordinaretur; sed ait, "Si quis sine crimine est," sicut est homicidium, adulterium, aliqua immunditia fornicationis, furtum, fraus, sacrilegium, et cætera hujusmodi.

obliged to show his resentment and detestation of the fact by putting her away, under pain of deposition, if he continued to live with her. For so the council of Neo-Cæsarea[1] words it; "A man, whose wife is evidently convicted of adultery while he is a layman, shall not be ordained; but if she commit adultery after his ordination, he ought to put her away; and, if he cohabit with her, he may not retain her and his ministry together." The council of Eliberis[2] is still more severe in this case, denying communion to such persons even at their last hour, who retained wives guilty of adultery;—"because," says the canon, "they, who ought to be examples of good conversation to others, do by this means teach others the way to sin." 2dly, The other thing to be observed is, that if a bishop neglected to inflict the censures of the Church upon any of his clergy, who were guilty of fornication, he made himself liable to be deposed. As Socrates[3] observes the Arians themselves deposed Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, for this reason among others, that he had admitted a deacon to communion, who had been taken in fornication.

Sect. 4.—Also Lapsing in Time of Persecution.

Another crime, which brought many clerks under this kind of ecclesiastical censure, was that of lapsing in time of persecution. In which case repentance was allowed to restore them to the peace of the Church as laymen, if they pleased, but not to officiate or communicate as ecclesiastics any longer. Thus Trophimus was treated in the time of Cornelius and Cyprian;[4] he was admitted to communicate as a layman, but not to retain his office of priesthood. And this Cyprian says,[5] was then the rule at Rome and over all

---

[1] Con. Neo-Cæs. c. 8. Ἐὰν μετα τὴν χειροτονίαν μοιχευθῇ, ὀφείλει ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν. ἐὰν δὲ συζῇ, ὁ δύναται ἔχεσθαι της ἐγχειρισθείσης αὐτῷ ὑπηρεσίας, [2] Con. Eliber. c. 65. Si cujus Clerici uxor fuerit mœchata, et sciat eam maritus suus mœchari, et eam non statim projecerit, nec in fine accipiat communionem: ne ab his qui exemplum bonæ conversationis esse debent, videantur magisteria scelerum proeedere. [3] Socrat. lib. ii. c. 42. [4] Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 106. Sic tamen admissus est Trophimus, ut Laicus communicet - - - non quasi locum Sacerdotis usurpet. [5] Id Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Pleb. Hispan. p. 174. Frustrà tales episcopatum sibi usurpare conantur, &c.

the world, if bishops or any other lapsed in time of persecution, to admit them to do penance in the Church, but withal to remove them from the function of the clergy and honour of the priesthood. As the African synod, in whose name he writes to the Spanish Churches, determined in the case of Basilides and Martial, two Spanish bishops, who, when they had lapsed, thought to qualify themselves by repentance to retain their bishoprics; but this, he tells them, was contrary to the rule and practice of the Universal Church. He repeats this in several other Epistles,[1] where he has occasion to speak of persons in the same unhappy circumstances with them. We find the same order in the Canons of Peter,[2] bishop of Alexandria, and the first council of Arles,[3] where not only such as fell by sacrificing, or open denial of their faith, but also all traditors are included in the number of lapsers, that is, all such as either gave up their Bibles, or the holy vessels of the Church, or the names of their brethren to the persecutors; and all such, who were of the clergy, are for ever excluded from the exercise and benefit of their order and function. Such was the discipline of the ancient Church in reference to those guides, who set their people an ill example by their apostacy in time of persecution; it was not thought fit to trust them to be guides and leaders for the future. Though I do not deny, but that some exceptions may be found to this general rule, either when the discipline of the Church was not so strict, or when it was otherwise found more for the benefit of the Church to restore lapsers to their honours, than to degrade and remove them wholly from them. For I have noted before, that both lapsers, and heretics, and schismatics, were sometimes more favourably treated, when the Church thought she might find her account in showing favour to them.

---

[1] Cypr. Ep. 55. al. 59. ad Cornel. p. 133. It. Ep. 64. al. 65. ad Epictet.

[2] Petr. Alex. Ep. Canon. c. 10. Ὅτε δὲ ἔπταισαν, οὐκ ἔτι δυνανται λειτουργεῖν.

[3] Con. Arelat. i. c. 13. De his qui Scripturas Sanctas tradidisse dicuntur, vel vasa dominica, vel nomina fratrum suorum, placuit nobis, ut quicunque eorum ex actis publicis fuerit detectus, non verbis nudis, ab ordine cleri amoveatur.

SECT. 5.—And Drinking and Gaming.

But to proceed with the laws of the Church relating to other misdemeanors. As the life of a clergyman was a continual attendance upon the altar, and constantly to be employed in the exercise of divine and heavenly things; so upon that account the utmost sobriety was required of him, together with a strict care to spend his time aright, and lay it out usefully; so as might best answer the ends of his calling, and those spiritual employments he was daily to be engaged in. And for this reason drinking and gaming, those two great consumers of time, and enemies of all noble undertakings and generous services, were strictly prohibited the clergy under the same penalty of deprivation. For so the Apostolical Canons word it,[1] "A bishop, presbyter, or deacon, that spends time in drinking or playing at dice, shall either reform, or be deposed." Where we may observe this difference between this and the former laws, that it does not make every single act of these crimes *ipso facto* deprivation, but only continuance therein without reforming. And by Justinian's law[2] the penalty for playing at tables is changed from deprivation to a triennial suspension, and intrusion into a monastery for the performance of repentance. Some perhaps will wonder at the severity of these laws in prohibiting the exercise of tables under such a penalty; but their wonder will cease, when they are told, that it was equally prohibited to the laity under pain of excommunication. For the council of Eliberis orders,[3] "that a Christian playing at dice or tables shall not be admitted to the holy communion, but after a year's penance and abstinence, and his total amendment." And there was good reason for the Church to make such a law in those times, because this kind of gaming was prohibited both by the old and new civil law[4] among the Romans, and many other nations, of which the reader may find a particular account in our learned

---

[1] Can. Apost. 42. Κύβοις σχολάζων ἢ μέθαις, ἢ παυσάσθω ἢ καθαιρέσθω. [2] Justin. Novel. 123. c. 10. [3] Con. Eliber. c. 79. Si quis Fidelis aleâ, id est, tabulâ luserit, placuit eum abstinere: et si emendatus cessaverit, poterit post annum communione reconciliari. [4] Digest. lib. xi. tit. 5. de Aleator. It Cod. Justin. lib. iii. tit. 43. de Aleator.

bishop Taylor,[1] together with the reasons of the prohibition, viz.—the evils that commonly attended this sort of play, blasphemies, and swearing, and passion, and lying, and cursing, and covetousness, and fraud, and quarrels, and intemperance of all sorts, the consumption of time, and ruin of many families; which excesses had made it infamous and scandalous among all nations. So that, what was so universally prohibited at that time by the laws of all nations, the Church could not but in decency prohibit by her own laws to the laity, and more especially to the clergy, to prevent scandal, and obviate those objections, which might otherwise have justly been raised against her. Not that the thing was simply unlawful in itself, when used only as an innocent recreation; but the many evil appendages, that commonly attended the use of it, had made it scandalous, and consequently inexpedient; and the spending of time upon it did much alter the nature of it, and make it so much the more unlawful.

SECT. 6.—And negotiating upon Usury. The Nature of this Crime inquired into.

Another crime, for which a clergyman was liable to be deposed, was the taking of usury, which, by the ancient canons, is frequently condemned as a species of covetousness and cruelty, and upon that score so strictly prohibited to the clergy, who were rather to study to excel in the practice of the contrary virtues, charity, mercifulness, and contempt of the world and all filthy lucre. The laws condemning this vice are too many to be here transcribed: it will be sufficient to repeat the canon of the council of Nice, which contains the sum, and speaks the sense of all the rest. Now the words of that canon are these;[2]—"Forasmuch as many clerks, following covetousness and filthy lucre, and forgetting the Holy Scriptures, which speak of the righteous man, 'as one that hath not given his money upon usury,' have let forth their money upon usury, and taken the usual monthly increase; it seemed good to this great and holy synod, that if any one, after this decree, shall be found to

[1] Taylor Duct. Dubitant. lib. iv. c. 1. p. 776.

[2] Con. Nic. c. 17.

take usury, or demand the principal with half the increase of the whole, or shall invent any other such methods for filthy lucre's sake, he shall be degraded from his order, and have his name struck out of the roll of the Church." The reader will find the same practice censured by those called the Apostolical Canons,[1] the council of Eliberis,[2] the first and second of Arles,[3] the first and third of Carthage,[4] the council of Laodicea,[5] and Trullo,[6] not to mention private writers, Cyprian,[7] Sidonius Apollinarius,[8] St. Jerom,[9] and many others. Nor need this seem strange to any one, that usury should be so generally condemned in the clergy; since it is apparent, that the practice of it was no less disallowed in the laity; for the first council of Carthage[10] condemns it in them both, but only makes it a more aggravating crime in the clergy. The council of Eliberis also,[11] that orders clergymen to be degraded for it, makes it an high misdemeanor in laymen; which, if they persisted in the practice of it after admonition, was to be punished with excommunication. We are here, therefore, in the next place to inquire into the nature of this practice, and the grounds and reasons, upon which it was so generally condemned both in clergymen and laymen. As to the nature of the thing, we are to observe, that, among the ancient Romans, there were several sorts or degrees of usury. 1st, The most common was that, which they called *Centesimæ;* the council of Nice[12] calls it Ἑκατοσταὶ; and the council of Trullo[13] uses the same word, which signifies *the hundredth part* of the principal paid every month, and answers to twelve in the hundred by the year. For the Romans received usury by the month, that is, at the kalends or first day of every month. Whence St. Basil[14] calls the months the parents of usury. And St.

[1] Can. Apost. c. 44. [2] Con. Eliber. c. 20. [3] Con. Arelat. i. c. 12. Arelat. ii. c. 14. [4] Con. Carth. i. c. 13. Carth. iii. c. 16. [5] Con. Laodic. c. 5. [6] Con. Trull. c. 10. [7] Cypr. de Lapsis, p. 124. [8] Sidon. lib. i. Ep. 8. [9] Hieron. in Ezek. cap. 18. [10] Con. Carth. i. c. 13. Quod in Laicis reprehenditur, id multo magis in Clericis oportet prædamnari. [11] Con. Eliber. c. 20. Si quis etiam Laicus accepisse probatur usuras - - - si in eâ iniquitate duraverit, ab Ecclesiâ sciat se esse projiciendum. Vid. Chrysost. Hom. 56. in Mat. [12] Con. Nic. c. 17. [13] Con. Trull. c. 10. Chrysost. Hom. 56. in Mat. Chrysost. Hom. 5. De Pœnit. t. i. p. 686. [14] Basil. in Psalm. 14. t. iii. p. 137. Φοβεῖται τὰς μῆνας ὡς τόκων πατέρας.

Ambrose says,[1] the Greeks gave usury the name of Τόκος, upon this account, because the kalends *bring forth* one in the hundred, and every month *begets* new usury. And hence, as the Poet acquaints us,[2] it became a proverb among the Romans to say, "A man trembles like a debtor, when the kalends are coming;" because that was the time of paying interest. Now this sort of usury is generally proscribed by the laws of the Church, because it was esteemed great oppression. Though the civil law allowed the practice of it; for Constantine, Anno, 325, the same year that the council of Nice was held, published a law, stating the rules and measures of usury,[3] wherein the creditor is allowed to take this centesimal usury, or one in the hundred every month, and no more. For it seems the old Roman laws granted a greater liberty before this regulation of Constantine. Afterward a new regulation was made, and it was only allowed in some certain cases, as where the creditor seemed to run some hazard, as appears from the laws of Justinian,[4] where he settles the business of interest and usury in his Code. For in trajectitious contracts, as the law terms them, that is, when a creditor lent money,—suppose at Rome, to receive interest for it only upon condition of the debtor's safe arrival with it at Constantinople;—because in that case the creditor ran a great hazard, he was allowed to receive a centesimal interest upon that account. Secondly, Another sort of usury was that which the canons call Ἡμιολίαι, or *Sescuplum, the whole and half as much more.* St. Jerom[5] takes notice of this kind of usury, and condemns it. "For men," he says, "were used to exact usury, for the loan of

---

[1] Ambr. de Tobia c. 12. Τόκες Græci appellaverunt usuras, eò quòd dolores partûs animæ debitoris excitare videantur. Veniunt Kalendæ, parit sors centesimam. Veniunt menses singuli, generantur usuræ. [2] Horat. lib. i. sat. 3. Odisti et fugis, ut Drusonem debitor æris - - quum tristes misero venere Kalendæ. [3] Cod. Th. lib. ii. tit. 33. de Usuris. leg. 1. Pro pecuniâ ultra singulas centesimas creditor vetatur accipere. [4] Cod. Just. lib. iv. tit. 32. de Usuris leg. 26. In trajectitiis autem contractibus, vel specierum fœnori dationibus, usque ad centesimam tantummodò licere stipulari, nec eam excedere, licèt veteribus legibus hoc erat concessum. [5] Hieron. Com. in Ezek. xviii. p. 537. Solent in agris frumenti et milii, vini et olei, cæterarumque specierum usuræ exigi. - - - Verbi gratiâ, ut hyemis tempore demus decem modios, et in messe recipiamus quindecim, hoc est, amplius partem mediam.

corn, wine, oil, millet, and other fruits of the ground; lending ten bushels in winter, on condition to receive fifteen in harvest, that is, the whole and half as much more. Which sort of usury, being a very grievous extortion and great oppression, is condemned not only in the clergy by the councils of Nice[1] and Laodicea,[2] under the name of Ἡμιολίαι; but also in laymen by the law of Justinian,[3] which allows nothing above centesimal interest to be taken by any person in any case whatsoever. Though Justinian intimates, that formerly the laws allowed it. And it is evident from the law of Constantine, still extant in the Theodosian Code,[4] which determined, "that if any creditor lent to the indigent any fruits of the earth, whether wet or dry, he might demand again the principal, and half as much more by way of usury;" as if he lent two bushels, he might require three. Thirdly, Another sort of usury is called by the civil law, *Bessis Centesimæ*, which is *two-thirds of centesimal interest*, and the same as eight in the hundred. And this the law[5] allowed masters of workhouses and other tradesmen to take in their negotiations with others. Fourthly, All other persons were only allowed to receive half the centesimal interest by the same law of Justinian,[6] which is the same as six in the hundred. Fifthly, Persons of quality were bound to take no more but a third part of the *Centesima*,[7] which is only four in the hundred. Sixthly, Interest upon interest was absolutely forbidden by the Roman laws[8] to all persons in any case whatsoever, as is evident

---

[1] Con. Nic. c. 17. [2] Con. Laod. c. 6. [3] Cod. Just. ubi suprà, It. Novel. 32, 33, 34. [4] Cod. Th. lib. ii. tit. 33. leg. 1. Quicunque fruges, aridas vel humidas, indigentibus mutuas dederint, usuræ nomine tertiam partem superfluam consequantur: id est, ut si summa crediti in duobus modiis fuerit, tertium modium amplius consequantur. [5] Cod. Just. lib. iv. tit. 32. de Usuris. leg. 26. Illos, qui ergasteriis præsunt, vel aliquam licitam negotiationem gerunt, usque ad bessem centesimæ, usurarum nomine, in quocunque contractu suam stipulationem moderari. [6] Cod. Just. ibid. Cæteros omnes homines Dimidiam tantummodò centesimæ usurarum nomine posse stipulari.—Ἕφεκτος τοκος. ὁ ἐπι τὸ ἕφεκτον κεφαλάιω—A sixth part of the whole. Suidas voce Ἕφεκτος. [7] Ibid. Jubemus illustribus quidem personis, sive eas præcedentibus, minime licere ultra tertiam partem centesimæ in quocunque contractu stipulari. [8] Cod. Just. lib. iv. tit. 32. leg. 28. Ut nullo modo usuræ usurarum a debitoribus exigantur, veteribus quidem legibus constitutum fuerat, &c.

from an edict of Justinian's, which both mentions and confirms the ancient prohibition of it by the laws of the emperors, that were before him. So that, several of these kinds of usury being prohibited to the laity in general by the laws of the state, it was no wonder that they should be more severely forbidden to the clergy by the laws of the Church. Then for the other sorts of usury, which the state allowed, the Church had two reasons for discouraging the practice of them in the clergy. First, because usury was most commonly exacted of the poor, which the Church reckoned an oppression of them, who were rather to be relieved by the charity of lending without usury, as the Gospel requires. Secondly, the clergy could not take usury of the rich and trading part of the world, but that must needs engage them in secular business and worldly concerns, more than the wisdom of the Church in those times thought fit to allow. And this I take to be the true state of the case, and the sum of the reasons for prohibiting the clergy the practice of usury in the primitive Church. Usury was generally a great oppression to the poor, as the ancient writers,[1] who speak against it, commonly complain. Or else it was thought to argue, and proceed from, a covetous and worldly mind; which made men forsake their proper employment, and betake themselves to other business, which was beside their calling, and could not then be followed without some reproach and dishonour to it. Therefore Cyprian[2] speaking of some bishops, who were the reproach of his age, in enumerating their miscarriages, joins all these things together; "that they, who ought to have been examples and encouragers to the rest, had cast off the care of divine service, to manage secular affairs; and leaving their sees, and deserting their people, they rambled into other provinces to catch at business that would bring them

[1] Vide Chrysost. Hom. 56. in Mat. Basil. Hom. in Psalm xiv. p. 136, &c.
[2] Cypr. de Lapsis. p. 123. Episcopi plurimi quos et hortamento esse oportet cæteris et exemplo, divinâ procuratione contemptâ, procuratores rerum secularium fieri, derelictâ cathedrâ, plebe desertâ, per alienas provincias oberrantes, negotiationis quæstuosæ nundinas aucupari, esurientibus in Ecclesiâ fratribus non subvenire, habere argentum largiter velle, fundos insidiosis fraudibus rapere, usuris multiplicantibus fœnus augere.

in gain: meanwhile the poor brethren of the Church were suffered to starve without relief, whilst their minds were set upon hoarding up silver in abundance, and getting estates by fraudulent arts, and exercising usury to augment their own treasures." When usury was ordinarily attended with such concomitants as these, it was no wonder it should be utterly proscribed by the holy fathers of the Church. Besides St. Chrysostom plainly intimates,[1] "that in his time all senators and persons of quality were absolutely forbidden to take usury by the laws of the commonwealth." And that consideration probably so much the more inclined the fathers of the Church to forbid it to the clergy, lest they should seem to be outdone by men of a secular life; and it might be objected to them, that the laws of the Church in this respect were more remiss than the laws of the state.

Sect. 7.—Of the Hospitality of the Clergy.

Indeed the necessities of the poor, and fatherless, and strangers, and widows in those early times were so importunate and craving in every Church, that their revenues would seldom answer all their demands. "The Church," as St. Austin says,[2] "had very rarely any thing to lay up in bank. And then it did not become a bishop to hoard up gold, and turn away the poor empty from him. They had daily so many poor petitioners, so many in distress and want continually applying to them; that they were forced to leave some in their sorrows, because they had not wherewith to relieve them all." Now in this case, where there was need of greater charities, than they had funds or abilities to bestow, there could be no room for usury, but with great neglect and uncharitableness to the poor. And there-

[1] Chrys. Hom. 56. in Matth. Τοὺς γῆν ἐν ἀξιώμασιν ὄντας, καὶ εἰς τὴν μεγάλην τελοῦντας βουλὴν, ἣν συγκλητον καλοῦσιν, οὐ θέμις τοιούτοις κέρδεσιν καταισχύνεσθαι. Honorius, Anno 397, published a law which implies the same. Cod. Theod. lib. ii. tit. 33. de Usuris, leg. 3. Though by a following law, Anno 405, he allowed senators half the centesimal interest.

[2] Aug. Serm. 49. de Diversis sive de Vitâ Clericor. tom. x. p. 520. Enthecam nobis habere non licet. Non enim est Episcopi servare aurum, et revocare à se mendicantis manum. Quotidiè tam multi petunt, tam multi gemunt, tam multi nos inopes interpellant; ut plures tristes relinquamus, quia quod possimus dare omnibus, non habemus.

fore, instead of lending upon usury, they were obliged to be exemplary in the practice of the contrary virtues, hospitality and charity; which the ancients call,[1] lending upon divine usury, not to receive one in the hundred, but an hundred for one from the hands of God. "It was then one of the glories of a bishop," St. Jerom tells us,[2] "to be a provider for the poor; but a disgrace to the holy function, to seek only to enrich himself." And therefore he gives this direction to Nepotian, among other good rules, which he prescribes him, "that his table should be free to the poor and strangers, that with them he might have Christ for his guest." St. Chrysostom[3] speaks nobly of his bishop Flavian upon the account of this virtue; he says, "his house was always open to strangers, and such as were forced to fly for the sake of religion: where they were received and entertained with that freedom and humanity, that his house might as properly be called, the house of strangers, as the house of Flavian. Yea, it was so much the more his own, for being common to strangers; for whatever we possess, is so much the more our property for being communicated to our poor brethren; there being no place where we may so safely lay up our treasure, as in the hands and bellies of the poor."

SECT. 8.—Of their Frugality and Contempt of the World.

Now the better to qualify them to perform this duty, every clergyman was required to lead a frugal life; that is, to avoid profuseness, as well in their own private concerns, as in giving great entertainments to the rich; which is but a false-named hospitality, and a great usurper upon the rights and revenues of the poor. We may judge of the simplicity of those times by the character, which Ammianus Marcellinus, the heathen historian,[4] gives of the Italian

[1] Pet. Chrysolog. Serm. 25. p. 269. Usura mundi centum ad unum, Deus unum accipit ad centum. Vid. Chrysost. Hom. 56. in Matt. xvii. p. 507. Ed. Commelin. [2] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. Gloria Episcopi est pauperum opibus providere: ignominia omnium Sacerdotum est propriis studere Divitiis. [3] Chrys. Ser. 1. in Gen. tom. ii. p. 886. Ed. Front. Ducæi. [4] Ammian. lib. xxvii. p. 458. Antistites quosdam provinciales tenuitas edendi potandique parcissimè, vilitas etiam indumentorum, et supercilia humum spectantia, perpetuo Numini verisque ejus cultoribus, ut puros commendant et verecundos.

bishops, as it is probable, from his own observation: he says, "their spare diet, and frugal way of living, their cheap clothing and grave deportment, did recommend them to God and his true worshippers, as persons of pure and modest souls." This made those country-bishops more honourable, in his opinion, than if they had lived in the riches, and state, and splendour of the bishops of Rome. By a canon of the fourth council of Carthage,[1] all the African bishops were obliged to live after this manner; not to affect rich furniture, or sumptuous entertainments, or a splendid way of living, but to seek to advance the dignity and authority of their order by their faith and holy living. Some indeed were for that other sort of hospitality, for entertaining the rich, and especially the magistrates, on pretence that they might keep an interest in them, and be able to intercede with them for poor criminals, when they were condemned. But St. Jerom particularly considers and answers this pretence in his instructions to Nepotian. "You must avoid," says he,[2] "giving great entertainments to secular men, and especially those that are in great offices. For it is not very reputable to have the lictors and guards of a consul stand waiting at the doors of a priest of Christ, who himself was crucified and poor; nor that the judge of a province should dine more sumptuously with you, than in the palace. If it be pretended, that you do this only to be able to intercede with him for poor criminals; there is no judge but will pay a greater deference and respect to a frugal clergyman, than a rich one, and show greater reverence to your sanctity, than your riches. Or if he be such an one, as will not hear a clergyman's intercessions but only among his cups, I should freely be without this benefit, and rather beseech Christ for the judge himself, who can more speedily and powerfully help than any judge." St. Jerom in the same place[3] advises his clerk not to be over free in receiving other men's entertainments neither. "For the laity," says he, "should rather find us to be comforters

[1] Con. Carth. 4. c. 15. Ut Episcopus vilem supellectilem et mensam ac victum pauperem habeat, et dignitatis suæ auctoritatem fide et meritis vitæ quærat. [2] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. [3] Ibid. Facilè contemnitur Clericus, qui sæpe vocatus ad prandium, ire non recusat.

in their mournings, than companions in their feasts. That clerk will quickly be contemned, that never refuses any entertainments, when he is frequently invited to them." Such were the ordinary rules and directions given by the ancients, for regulating the hospitality and frugality of the clergy. But many bishops and others far exceeded these rules in transcendent heights of abstinence, and acts of self-denial, freely chosen and imposed upon themselves, that they might have greater plenty and superfluities to bestow upon others. Gregory Nazianzen gives us this account of St. Basil,[1] "that his riches was to possess nothing; to live content with that little, which nature requires; to despise delicacies and pleasures, and set himself above the slavery of that cruel and sordid tyrant, the belly. His most delicious and constant food was bread and salt and water; his clothing but one coat and one gown; his lodging upon the ground; not for want of better accommodations; for he was metropolitan of Cæsarea, and had considerable revenues belonging to his Church; but he submitted to this way of living in imitation of his Saviour, who became poor for our sakes, that we through his poverty might be made rich." And therefore both the same author,[2] and the Church-historians also tell us,[3] that, when in the time of the Arian persecution under Valens he was threatened by one of the emperor's agents, that unless he would comply he should have all his goods confiscated, his answer was, "that no such punishment could reach him, for he was possessed of nothing, unless the emperor wanted his threadbare clothes, or a few books, which was all the substance he was master of." St. Jerom gives the like character of Exuperius, bishop of Tholouse, who made other men's wants always his own; and, like the widow of Sarepta, pinched and denied himself to feed the poor, bestowing all his substance upon the bowels of Christ. Nay, such was his frugality, that he ministered the body of Christ in a basket of osiers, and the blood in a glass cup. "But nothing," says our author,[4]

---

[1] Naz. Orat. 20. de Laud. Basil, p. 357. [2] Naz. ibid. p. 349.
[3] Sozom. lib. vi. c. 16. [4] Hieron. Ep. 4. ad Rustic. Nihil illo ditius, qui corpus Domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro.

"could be more rich or glorious, than such a poverty as this." It were easy to give a thousand instances of the same nature in the Cyprians, the Austins, the Nazianzens, the Paulinuses, and other such like generous spirits of the age they lived in; who contemned the world with greater pleasure, than others could admire or enjoy it. But as such heights of heroic virtues exceeded the common rule, they are not proposed as the strict measures of every man's duty, but only to excite the zeal of the forward and the good. It may be said of this, as our Saviour says of a parallel case,—"All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given; but he that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

SECT. 9.—Whether the Clergy were anciently obliged by any Law to part with their Temporal Possessions.

Some indeed would fain turn this prudential advice into a law, and attempt to prove, that anciently the clergy were under an obligation to quit their temporal possessions, when they betook themselves to the service of the Church. But this is to outface the sun at noon-day. For as there is no just ground for this assertion, so there are the plainest evidences to the contrary. Among those called the Apostolical Canons,[1] there is one to this purpose: "Let the goods of the bishop, if he has any of his own, be kept distinct from those of the Church; that when he dies he may have power to dispose of them, to whom he pleases, and as he pleases; and not receive damage in his private effects upon pretence, that they were the goods of the Church. For perhaps he has a wife, or children, or relations, or servants; and it is but just both before God and man, that neither the Church should suffer for want of knowing what belonged to the bishop, nor the bishop's relations be damaged by the Church, or come into trouble upon that account, which would be to the scandal and reproach of the deceased bishop." Many other canons both of the Greek and Latin Church are to the same effect.[2] Nor can it be pretended,

[1] Can. Apost. c. 40. Ἔστω φανερὰ τὰ ἴδια τοῦ ἐπισκόπου πράγματα (εἴγε καὶ ἴδια ἔχει) καὶ φανερὰ τὰ κυριακά, &c. [2] Con. Antioch. c. 24. Con. Agathen. c. 48. Con. Carth. 3. c. 49.

that this is to be understood only of such estates as they got in the service of the Church. For St. Ambrose plainly intimates, that the law left the clergy in the full possession of their patrimony, or temporal estates, which they had before. For he brings in some malcontents among the clergy thus complaining:[1] "What advantage is it to me to be of the clergy, to suffer injuries, and undergo hard labour, as if my own estate would not maintain me?" This implies, that men of estates were then among the clergy. And indeed there was but one case, in which any clerk could be compelled to quit his possessions, and that was, when his estate was originally tied to the service of the empire, of which I have given a full account before. In all other cases it was matter of free choice, and left to his liberty, whether he would dispose of his estate to any pious use or not. Only, if he did not, it was expected he should be more generous in his charities, and less burdensome to the Church, his needs being supplied another way. Though neither was this forced upon him by any law, but only urged upon reasons of charity;[2] leaving him judge of his own necessities, and not forbidding him to have his dividend in the Church, if in his own prudence he thought fit to require it. Socrates[3] commends Chrysanthus, a Novatian bishop, upon this account, that having an estate of his own, he never took any thing of the Church, save two loaves of the *Eulogiæ*, or offerings on Sunday; though he does not once intimate, that there was any law to compel him to do so. As neither does Prosper, who speaks most of any other against rich men's taking their portion in the charities of the Church. He reckons it indeed[4] a dishonourable act and a sin in them, because it was to deprive others of the Church's charity, who stood more in need of it; and he thinks, though a rich clergyman might keep his own estate without sin, because there was no law but the law of perfection to oblige him to renounce it, yet it must

---

[1] Ambr. Ep. 17. Quid mihi prodest in Clero manere, subire injurias, labores perpeti, quasi non possit aget meus me pascere. [2] Vide Can. Apost. c. 41. Con. Antioch, c. 25. [3] Socrat. lib. vii, c. 12. [4] Prosper. de Vit. Contempl. lib. ii. c. 12. Noverint esse deformius, possessores de eleemosynis pauperum pasci.

be upon condition, that he required none of the maintenance of the Church.[1] But he only delivers this as his own private opinion, and does not signify, that there was then any such standing law in the Church. In Afric they had a peculiar law against covetousness in the time of St. Austin, which was,[2] "That, if any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any other clerk, who had no estate when they were ordained, did afterward purchase lands in their own name, they should be impleaded as guilty of invading the Lord's revenue, unless upon admonition they conferred the same upon the Church." For in those times the Church-revenues being small, no one's dividend was more than a competent maintenance; and therefore it was presumed, that he, who could purchase lands in such circumstances, must have been some way injurious to the public revenues of the Church. But in the same law it was provided, that, if any estate was left them by donation or inheritance, they might dispose of it as they pleased themselves; for the Church made no rules, but only gave her advice, in such cases as these; exhorting her wealthy clergy to greater degrees of liberality, but not demanding their estates to have them at her own disposal. On the other hand, when clergymen, who had no visible estates of their own, and were single men, and had no poor families to provide for, were busily intent upon growing rich out of the revenues of the Church; this was always esteemed a scandalous covetousness, and accordingly prosecuted with sharp invectives by St. Jerom[3] and others of the ancient writers. So much of the laws of charity, which concerned the ancient clergy.

---

[1] Prosper. de Vit. Contempl. lib. ii. c. 12. Illi qui tam infirmi sunt, ut possessionibus suis renunciare non possint; si ea quæ accepturi erant, dispensatori relinquant, nihil habentibus conferenda, sine peccato possident sua.
[2] Con. Carth. 3. c. 49. Placuit, ut Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, vel quicunque Clerici, qui nihil habentes ordinantur, et tempore episcopatûs vel clericatûs sui, agros vel quæcunque prædia nomine suo comparant, tanquam rerum divinarum invasionis crimine teneantur obnoxii, nisi admoniti Ecclesiæ eadem ipsa contulerint.
[3] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. Nonnulli sunt ditiores monachi, quàm fuerant seculares; et Clerici qui possideant opes sub Christo paupere, quas sub locuplete et fallace Diabolo non habuerant: ut suspiret eos Ecclesia divites, quos mundus tenuit ante mendicos.

SECT. 10.—Of their great Care to be inoffensive with their Tongues.

I might here give a character of their meekness, modesty, gravity, humility, and several other virtues, which Nazianzen describes in the person of his own father; but I shall but take notice of two things more, which concerned the conduct of their lives, and those are the laws relating first to their words, and secondly to their fame and reputation. For their words, they, who were to teach others the most difficult part of human conduct, the government of the tongue, were highly concerned to be examples to the people as well in word as action. And to this purpose the laws were very severe against all manner of licentious discourse in their conversation. The fourth council of Carthage has three canons together upon this head; one of which[1] forbids scurrility, and buffoonery, or that foolish talking and jesting with obscenity, which the Apostle calls, Βωμολοχία, under the penalty of deprivation. Another[2] threatens such with excommunication, as use to swear by the name of any creature. And a third canon[3] menaces the same punishment to such as sing at any public entertainments. St. Jerom[4] particularly cautions his clerk against detraction, because of the temptation he may lie under either to commit the sin himself, or give way to it in others, by hearkening to and reporting false suggestions after them. Which is much the same thing; "for no slanderer tells his story to one that is not willing to hear him." "An arrow," says he, "never fixes upon a stone, but often recoils back, and wounds him that shoots it. Therefore let the detracter learn to be less forward and busy, by your unwillingness to hear his detraction." St. Chrysostom[5] takes notice of this vice, as most incident to inferiors, whom envy and emulation

[1] Con. Carth. iv. c. 60. Clericum scarrilem, et verbis turpibus joculatorem, ab officio detrahendum. [2] Ibid. c. 61. Clericum per creaturas jurantem acerrimè objurgandum. Si perstiterit in vitio, excommunicandum. [3] Ibid. c. 62. Clericum inter epulas cantantem supradictæ sententiæ severitate coercendum. [4] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepot. Neque verò illa justa est excusatio,—referentibus aliis, injuriam facere non possum. Nemo invito auditori libenter refert, &c. [5] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. v. c. 8.

too often prompt to detract from the authority and virtues of their bishop; especially when they are grown popular and admired for their own eloquent preaching; then, if they be of a bold and arrogant and vain-glorious temper, their business is to deride him in private, and detract from his authority, and make themselves every thing by lessening his just character and power. Upon this hint our author also takes occasion to show, what an extraordinary courage and spirit, and how divine and even a temper a bishop ought to have, that by such temptations, and a thousand others of the like nature, he be not overwhelmed either with anger or envy on the one hand, or insuperable sorrow and dejection of mind on the other. St. Jerom recommends another virtue of the tongue to his clerk, which is of great use in conversation; and that is the keeping of secrets, and knowing when to be silent, especially about the affairs of great men. "Your office," says he,[1] "requires you to visit the sick, and thereby you become acquainted with the families of matrons and their children, and are entrusted with the secrets of noble men. You ought therefore to keep not only a chaste eye, but also a chaste tongue. And as it is not your business to be talking of the beauties of women, so neither to let one house know from you what was done in another. For if Hippocrates adjured his disciples, before he taught them, and made them take an oath of silence; if he formed them in their discourse, their gait, their meekness, and modesty, their habit, and their whole morals; how much more ought we, who have the care of souls committed to us, to love the houses of all Christians, as if they were our own?" He means, that the clergy should be formed to the art of silence, as carefully as Hippocrates taught his scholars; that the peace and unity of Christian families might not be disturbed or discomposed by revealing the secrets of one to another; which it is certain no one will do, that has the property, which St. Jerom requires, of loving every Christian family as his own.

---

[1] Hieron. Ep. ii. ad Nepotian.

SECT. 11.—Of their Care to guard against Suspicion of Evil.

2dly. As they were thus taught to be inoffensive both in word and deed, and thereby secure a good name and reputation among men, which was necessary for the due exercise of their function; so, because it was possible their credit might be impaired, not only by the commission of real evil, but by the very appearance and suspicion of it, the laws of the Church upon this account were very exact in requiring them to set a guard upon their whole deportment, and avoid all suspicious actions, that might give the least umbrage or handle to an adversary to reproach them. It was not enough in this case, that a man kept a good conscience in the sight of God, but he must provide or forecast for honest things in the sight of men. And this was the more difficult, because men are apt to be querulous against the clergy, as St. Chrysostom observes, some through weakness and imprudence, others through malice, easily raising complaints and accusations without any just ground, and difficultly hearkening to any reasons or apologies, that they can offer in their own defence. But the more querulous and suspicious men are, the more watchful it becomes the clergy to be against unjust surmises, that they may cut off occasion from them that desire occasion to accuse or reproach them. To this end they are to use the utmost diligence and precaution to guard against the ill opinions of men, by avoiding all actions that are of a doubtful or suspicious nature. "For," says St. Chrysostom,[1] "if the holy Apostle St. Paul was afraid, lest he should have been suspected of theft by the Corinthians; and upon that account took others into the administration of their charity with himself, that no one might have the least pretence to blame him; how much more careful should we be to cut off all occasions of sinister opinions and suspicions, however false or unreasonable they may be, or disagreeeble to our character? For none of us can be so far removed from any sin, as St. Paul was from theft; yet he did not think fit to contemn the suspicions of the vulgar; he did not trust to

[1] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. vi. c. 9.

the reputation, which both his miracles and the integrity of his life had generally gained him: but on the contrary he imagined such suspicions and jealousies might arise in the hearts of some men, and therefore he took care to prevent them; not suffering them to arise at all, but timely foreseeing, and prudently forestalling them; providing, as he says, for honest things not only in the sight of God, but also in the sight of men. The same care and much greater should we take, not only to dissipate and destroy the ill opinions men may have entertained of us, but to foresee afar off from what causes they may spring, and to cut off before hand the very occasions and pretences from whence they may grow. Which is much easier to be done, than to extinguish them when they are risen, which will then be very difficult, perhaps impossible; besides that their being raised will give great scandal and offence, and wound the consciences of many." Thus that holy father argues upon this point, according to his wonted manner, nervously and strenuously, to show the clergy their obligations to use their utmost prudence to foresee and prevent scandal, by avoiding all actions of a doubtful and suspicious nature. St. Jerom[1] gives his clerk the same instructions, to guard against suspicions, and take care beforehand to minister no probable grounds for raising any feigned stories concerning him. If his office required him to visit the widows or virgins of the Church, he should never go to them alone, but always take some other persons of known probity and gravity with him, from whose company he would receive no defamation.

Sect. 12.—Laws relating to this Matter.

Nor was this only the private direction of St. Jerom, but a public rule of the Church. For in the third council of Carthage this canon was enacted,[2] "that neither bishop nor presbyter, nor any other clerk should visit the widows

---

[1] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepot. Caveto omnes suspiciones: et quicquid probabilitèr fingi potest, ne fingatur, ante devita, &c. [2] Con. Carth. iii. c. 25. Nec Episcopi, aut Presbyteri, soli habeant accessum ad hujusmodi fœminas, nisi aut Clerici præsentes sint, aut graves aliqui Christiani.

and virgins alone, but in the company and presence of some other of the clergy, or some grave Christians." And in the first council of Carthage,[1] and the council of Epone,[2] there are canons to the same purpose.

SECT. 13.—An Account of the *Agapetæ*, and Συνείσακτοι, and the Laws of the Church made against them.

The great council of Nice[3] made another order upon the same grounds, to prevent all sinister opinions, "that none of the unmarried clergy, bishop, presbyter, deacon, or any other should have any woman, that was a stranger, and not one of their kindred, to dwell with them; save only a mother, a sister, or an aunt, or some such persons, with whom they might live without suspicion." They, who hence conclude, that the clergy were forbidden to cohabit with their wives, which they had married before ordination, are sufficiently exposed by Gothofred,[4] as ignorant of the true import of the original word, Συνείσακτος, which never denotes a wife, but always *a stranger*, in opposition to those of one's kindred. And it is evident, the canon was made not upon the account of the married clergy, but the unmarried, to prevent suspicion and evil reports, that might easily arise from their familiar conversation with women, that were not of their kindred or near relations. We may be satisfied of this from a law of Honorius and Theodosius Junior, which was made in pursuance of the Nicene canon, and is still extant in both the Codes,[5] where first having forbidden the clergy to cohabit with any strange women, who by some were taken in under the title and appellation

---

[1] Con. Carth. i. c. 3. [2] Con. Epaunens. c. 20. [3] Con. Nicen. c. 3. Μὴ εξεῖναι συνείσακτον εχειν, πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἄρα, μητέρα, ἢ ἀδελφὴν, ἢ θειαν, &c. [4] Gothofred. Not. in. Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 44. [5] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 44. It. Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 3. leg. 19. Eum qui probabilem seculo disciplinam agit, decolari consortio sororiæ appellationis non decet. Quicunque igitur cujuscunque gradûs sacerdotio fulciuntur, vel clericatûs honore censentur, extranearum sibi mulierum interdicta consortia cognoscant; hâc eis tantùm facultate concessâ, ut matres, filias, atque germanas intra domorum suarum septa contineant. In his enim nihil sævi criminis existimari fœdus naturale permittit. Illas etiam non relinqui castitatis hortatur affectio quæ ante sacerdotium maritorum legitimum meruere conjugium. Neque enim Clericis incompetenter adjunctæ sunt, quæ dignos sacerdotio viros suâ conversatione fecerunt.

of sisters; and having named what persons they might lawfully entertain in their houses, viz. mothers, daughters, and sisters, because natural consanguinity would prevent all suspicion of these; lest not excepting of wives might seem to exclude them also, a particular clause is added concerning them, "that such, as were married before their husbands were ordained, should not be relinquished upon pretence of chastity, but rather be retained upon that account; it being but reasonable that they should be joined to their husbands, who by their conversation made their husbands worthy of the priesthood." The Συνείσακτοι then, or *strangers*, who in these laws are forbidden to cohabit with the clergy, are not their lawful wives, but others, who were taken in under the name of sisters, as that law of Honorius, and other ancient writers[1] intimate they were called by those that entertained them. St. Jerom[2] and Epiphanius[3] tell us, they were also known by the name of *Agapetæ*, Ἀγαπηταὶ, that is, *beloved*. So that all these several names signify but that one sort of persons, most commonly called *strangers*, *Extraneæ*, and Συνείσακτοι, whose conversation was suspicious, and therefore so often prohibited by the laws of the Church. They were commonly some of the virgins belonging to the Church, whom they, that entertained them, pretended only to love as sisters with a chaste love. But their manner of conversing was sometimes so very scandalous, that it justly gave great offence to all sober and modest persons; and had not the Church always interposed with her severest censures, it must have made her liable to as great reproach. For it appears from the complaints of St. Cyprian,[5] St. Jerom,[6] and others, that the practice of some was very intolerable. For they not only dwelt together in the same house, but lodged in the same room, and sometimes in the same bed; and yet would be thought innocent, and called

[1] Vid. Con. Ancyr. c. 19. [2] Hieron. Ep. 22. ad Eustoch. p. 138. [3] Epiphan. Hær. 63. Origen. n. 2. [4] Cypr. Ep. 6. al. 14. Ep. 7. al. 13. Ep. 62. al. 4. [5] Hieron. Ep. 22. ad Eustoch. de Virgin. Servand. Unde in Ecclesias Agapetarum pestis introiit? Unde sine nuptiis aliud nomen uxorum? Immò unde novum concubinarum genus? Plus inferam: Unde meretrices univiræ? Quæ eâdem domo, uno cubiculo, sæpe uno tenentur et lectulo; et suspiciosos nos vocant, si aliquid existimamus.

others uncharitable and suspicious, that entertained any hard thoughts of them. But the Church did not regard vain words, but treated them as they justly deserved, as persons that used a scandalous and indecent liberty, and who were the very pests and plagues of the Church. Cyprian[1] commends Pomponius for excommunicating a deacon, who had been found guilty in this kind. And the council of Antioch[2] alleged this among other reasons for their deposing Paulus Samosatensis from his bishopric. In the following ages, besides the councils of Nice and Ancyra already mentioned, we meet with many other canons made upon this account, as in the second council of Arles,[3] the first, third, and fourth, councils of Carthage,[4] the council of Eliberis,[5] and Lerida,[6] and many others prohibiting the clergy to entertain any women, who were strangers, and not of their near relations, under pain of deprivation. The intent of all which canons was to oblige the clergy, not only to live innocently in the sight of God, but also unblameably, and without suspicion, and censure in the sight of men. It being more especially necessary for men of their function to maintain not only a good conscience, but a good name; the one for their own sake, the other for the sake of their neighbours:[7] that men might neither be tempted to blaspheme the ways of God, by suspecting the actions of holy men to be impure, when they were not so; nor be induced to imitate such practices, as they at least imagined to be evil; either of which would turn to the destruction of their souls. So that it was cruelty and inhumanity, as St. Austin concludes, for a man, in such circumstances to neglect and disregard his own reputation.

SECT. 14.—Malevolent and unavoidable Suspicions to be contemned.

But it might happen, that a man, after the utmost human caution and prudence that could be used, might not be able to avoid the malevolent suspicions of ill-disposed men: for

[1] Cypr. Ep. 62. al. 4. ad. Pompon. [2] Epist. Synod. ap. Euseb. libi vii. c. 30. [3] Con. Arelat. ii. c. 3. [4] Con. Carth. i. c. 3. et 4. Carth iii. c. 17. Carth. iv. c. 46. [5] Con. Eliber. c. 27. [6] Con. Ilerdens. c. 15. [7] Aug. de Bono Viduitat. c. xxii. tom. 4. Nobis necessaria est vita nostra, aliis fama nostra, &c.

our blessed Lord, whose innocence and conduct were both equally divine, could not in his converse with men wholly escape them. Now in this case the Church could prescribe no other rule, but that of patience and Christian consolation, given by our Saviour to his Apostles;[1] "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake; rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven." "When we have done," says St. Austin,[2] "all that in justice and prudence we could to preserve our good name, if after that some men, notwithstanding, will endeavour to blemish our reputation, and blacken our character, either by false suggestions or unreasonable suspicions, let conscience be our comfort, nay, plainly our joy, that great is our reward in heaven. For this reward is the wages of our warfare, whilst we behave ourselves as good soldiers of Christ, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report."—So much of the laws of the Church, relating to the life and conversation of the ancient clergy.

CHAP. III.

Of Laws more particularly relating to the Exercise of the Duties and Offices of their Function.

Sect. 1.—The Clergy obliged to lead a studious Life.

I come now to speak of such laws as more immediately related to their function, and the several offices and duties belonging to it. In speaking of which, because many of these offices will come more fully to be considered hereafter, when we treat of the liturgy and service of the Church, I shall here speak chiefly of such duties, as were required of them by way of general qualification, to enable them the better to go through the particular duties of their function. Such was, in the first place, their obligation to lead a stu-

[1] Mat. v. 11. [2] Aug. ibid.

dious life. For since, as Gregory Nazianzen observes,[1] the meanest arts could not be obtained without much time, and labour, and toil, spent therein; it were absurd to think, that the art of wisdom, which comprehends the knowledge of things human and divine, and comprises every thing that is noble and excellent, was so light and vulgar a thing, as that a man needed no more but a wish or a will to obtain it. Some indeed, he complains,[2] were of this fond opinion, and therefore, before they had well passed the time of their childhood, or knew the names of the books of the Old and New Testament, or how well to read them, if they had but got two or three pious words by heart, or had read a few of the Psalms of David, and put on a grave habit, which made some outward show of piety, they had the vanity to think, they were qualified for the government of the Church. They then talked nothing but of Samuel's sanctification from his cradle, and thought themselves profound scribes, and great rabbies and teachers, sublime in the knowledge of divine things, and were for interpreting the Scripture, not by the letter, but after a spiritual way, propounding their own dreams and fancies, instead of the divine oracles, to the people. This, he complains, was for want of that study and labour, which ought to be the continual employment of persons, who take upon them the offices of the sacred function. St. Chrysostom pursues this matter a little further, and shows the necessity of continual labour and study in a clergyman, from the work and business he has upon his hand, each part of which requires great sedulity and application. For, first,[3] he ought to be qualified to minister suitable remedies to the several maladies and distempers of men's souls; the cure of which requires greater skill and labour than the cure of their bodily distempers. And this is only to be done by the doctrine of the Gospel, which therefore required, that he should be intimately acquainted with every part of it." Then again,[4] he must be able to stop the mouths of all gainsayers, Jews, gentiles, and heretics, who had different arts and different weapons to assault the

[1] Naz. Orat. i. de Fug. tom. i. p. 22. [2] Ibid. p. 21. [3] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. iv. c. 3. [4] Ibid. lib. iv. c. 4.

truth by; and unless he exactly understood all their fallacies and sophisms, and knew the true art of making a proper defence, he would be in danger not only of suffering each of them to make spoil and devastation of the Church, but of encouraging one error, whilst he was opposing another." For nothing was more common, than for ignorant and unskilful disputants to run from one extreme to another; as he shows in the controversies, which the Church had with the Marcionites and Valentinians on the one hand, and the Jews on the other, about the law of Moses; and the dispute about the Trinity between the Arians and Sabellians. Now, unless a man was well skilled and exercised in the Word of God, and the true art and rules of disputation, which could not be attained without continual study and labour, he concludes, "it would be impossible for him to maintain his ground, and the truth, as he ought, against so many subtle and wily opposers." Upon this he inculcates[1] that direction of St. Paul to Timothy, 1 Tim. iv. 13. "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine: meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all men." Thirdly, he shows,[2] "how difficult and laborious a work it was to make continual homilies and set discourses to the people, who were become very severe judges of the preacher's composures, and would not allow him to rehearse any part of another man's work, nor so much as to repeat his own upon a second occasion. Here his task was something the more difficult, because men had generally nice and delicate palates, and were inclined to hear sermons as they heard plays, more for pleasure than profit. Which added to the preacher's study and labour; who, though he was to contemn both popular applause and censure, yet was also to have such a regard to his auditory, as that they might hear him with pleasure to their edification and advantage." "And[3] the more famed and eloquent the preacher was, so much the more careful and studious ought he to be, that he may always answer his character, and not expose himself to the censures and accu-

[1] Chrys. Ibid. lib. iv. c. 8. [2] Ibid. lib. v. c. 1. [3] Ibid. lib. v. c. 5.

sations of the people." These and the like arguments does that holy father urge, to show how much it concerns men of the sacred calling to devote themselves to a studious and laborious life, that they may be the better qualified thereby to answer the several indispensible duties of their functions.

SECT. 2.—No Pleas allowed as just Apologies for the contrary.

Some indeed, St. Chrysostom says, were ready to plead even the Apostle's authority for their ignorance, and almost value themselves for want of learning, because the Apostle says of himself, that he was rude in speech. But to this the holy father justly replies,[1] "that this was a misrepresentation of the great Apostle, and vainly urged to excuse any man's sloth and negligence in not attaining to those necessary parts of knowledge, which the clerical life required. If the utmost heights and perfections of exotic eloquence had been rigidly exacted of the clergy; if they had been to speak always with the smoothness of Isocrates, or the loftiness of Demosthenes, or the majesty of Thucydides, or the sublimity of Plato; then indeed it might be pertinent to allege this testimony of the Apostle. But rudeness of style, in comparison of such eloquence, may be allowed; provided men be otherwise qualified with knowledge, and ability to preach and dispute accurately concerning the doctrines of faith and religion; as St. Paul was, whose talents in that kind have made him the wonder and admiration of the whole world; and it would be unjust to accuse him of rudeness of speech, who by his discourses confounded both Jews and Greeks, and wrought many into the opinion, that he was the Mercury of the gentiles. Such proofs of his power of persuasion were sufficient evidence, that he had spent some pains in this way; and therefore his authority was fondly abused to patronise ignorance and sloth, whose example was so great a reproach to them." Others again there were, who placed the whole of a minister in a good life, and that was made another excuse for the want of knowledge and study, and the art of preaching and disputing. But to this St. Chrysostom also replies,[2] "that

[1] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. iv. c. 6. [2] Ibid. c. 8 et 9.

both these qualifications were required in a priest; he must not only do, but teach the commands of Christ, and guide others by his word and doctrine, as well as his practice: each of these had their part in his office, and were necessary to assist one another, in order to consummate men's edification. For otherwise, when any controversy should arise about the doctrines of religion, and Scripture was pleaded in behalf of error; what would a good life avail in this case? What would it signify to have been diligent in the practice of virtue, if after all a man, through gross ignorance and unskilfulness in the Word of Truth, fell into heresy, and cut himself off from the body of the Church? as he knew many that had done so. But admit a man should stand firm himself, and not be drawn away by the adversaries; yet when the plain and simple people, who are under his care, shall observe their leader to be baffled, and that he has nothing to say to the arguments of a subtle opposer, they will be ready to impute this not so much to the weakness of the advocate, as the badness of his cause: and so, by one man's ignorance, a whole people shall be carried headlong to utter destruction; or at least be so shaken in their faith, that they shall not stand firm for the future." St. Jerom[1] gives also a smart rebuke to this plea, telling his clerk, "that the plain and rustic brother should not value himself upon his sanctity, and despise knowledge; as neither should the artful and eloquent speaker measure his holiness by his tongue. For though of two imperfections it was better to have a holy ignorance, than a vicious eloquence; yet to consummate a priest, both qualifications were necessary, and he must have knowledge, as well as sanctity, to fit him for the several duties of his function." Thus did those holy instructors plead against ignorance in the clergy, and urge them with proper arguments to engage them upon a studious life, which was the only way to furnish them with sufficient abilities to discharge many weighty duties of their function.

---

[1] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. Nec rusticus et tamen simplex frater ideò se sanctum putet, si nihil noverit: nec peritus et eloquens in linguâ æstimet sanctitatem. Multoque melius est è duobus imperfectis rusticitatem sanctam habere, quàm eloquentiam peccatricem.

SECT. 3.—Their chief Studies to be the Holy Scriptures, and the approved Writers and Canons of the Church.

But it was not all sorts of studies that they equally recommended, but chiefly the study of the Holy Scriptures; as being the fountains of that learning, which was most proper for their calling, and which upon all occasions they were to make use of. "For," as St. Chrysostom observes,[1] "in the way of administering spiritual physic to the souls of men, the Word of God was instead of every thing that was used in the cure of bodily distempers. It was instrument, and diet, and air; it was instead of medicine, and fire, and knife; if caustics or incisions were necessary, they were to be done by this; and if this did not succeed, it would be in vain to try other means. This was it, that was to raise and comfort the dejected soul, and take down and assuage the swelling tumors and presumptions of the confident. By this they were both to cut off what was superfluous, and supply what was wanting, and do every thing that was necessary to be done in the cure of souls. By this all heretics and aliens were to be convinced, and all the plots of Satan to be countermined: and therefore it was necessary, that the ministers of God should be very diligent in studying the Scriptures, that the word of Christ might dwell richly in them." This was necessary to qualify them especially for preaching; since, as St. Jerom rightly notes,[2] "the best commendation of a sermon was to have it seasoned well with Scripture rightly applied," Besides, the custom of expounding the Scripture occasionally, many times as it was read, required a man to be well acquainted with all the parts of it, and to understand both the phrase and sense, and doctrines, and mysteries of it, that he might be ready upon all occasions to discourse pertinently and usefully upon them. And to this purpose some canons appointed,[3]

---

[1] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. iv. c. 3. et 4. [2] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepot. Sermo Presbyteri Scripturarum lectione conditus sit. Nolo te declamatorem esse et rabulam, garrulumque sine ratione, sed mysteriorum peritum, &c.
[3] Con. Tolet. 3. c. 7. Quia solent crebrò mensis otiosæ fabulæ interponi, in omni sacerdotali convivio lectio Scripturarum divinarum misceatur: per hoc enim et animæ ædificantur in bonum, et fabulæ non necessariæ prohibentur.

"that their most vacant hours, the times of eating and drinking, should not pass without some portion of Scripture read to them; partly to exclude all other trifling and unnecessary discourse, and partly to afford them proper themes and subjects to exercise themselves upon to edification and advantage." St. Jerom[1] commends his friend Nepotian for this, "that at all feasts he was used to propound something out of the Holy Scripture, and entertain the company with some useful disquisition upon it. And next to the Scriptures he employed his time upon the study of the best ecclesiastical authors, whom by continual reading and frequent meditations he had so treasured up in the library of his heart, that he could repeat their words upon any proper occasion, saying, thus spake Tertullian, thus Cyprian, so Lactantius, after this manner Hilary, so Minucius Felix, so Victorinus, these were the words of Arnobius, and the like." But among ecclesiastical writings, the canons of the Church were always reckoned of greatest use; as containing a summary account not only of the Church's discipline, and doctrine, and government, but also rules of life and moral virtues; upon which account, as some laws directed, that the canons should be read over at every man's ordination; so others[2] required the clergy afterward to make them part of their constant study together with the Holy Scripture. For the canons were then a sort of directions for the pastoral care, and they had this advantage of any private directions, that they were the public voice and rubrics of the Church, and so much the more carefully to be read upon that account. In after ages in the time of Charles the Great, we find some laws[3] obliging the clergy to read, together with the canons, Gregory's book, *De Curâ Pastorali*.

---

[1] Hieron, Epitaph. Nepot. Ep. 3. ad Heliodor. Sermo ejus (leg. per) omne convivium de Scripturis aliquid proponere, &c. [2] Con. Tolet. 4. c. 24. Sciant Sacerdotes Scripturas sanctas, et Canones meditentur - - - ut ædificent cunctos tam fidei scientiâ, quàm operum disciplinâ. [3] Con. Turon. c. 3. Con. Cabillon, c. 1.

SECT. 4.—How far the Study of Heathen or Heretical Books was allowed.

As to other books and writings, they were more cautious and sparing in the study and use of them. Some canons[1] forbad a bishop to read heathen authors. Nor would they allow him to read heretical books, but only upon necessity, that is, when there was occasion to confute them, or to caution others against the poison of them. But the prohibition of heathen learning, though it seem to be more peremptory, was to be understood likewise with a little qualification. For men might have very different views and designs in reading heathen authors. Some might read them only for pleasure, and make a business of that pleasure, to the neglect of Scripture and more useful learning; and all such were highly to be condemned. St. Jerom says of these,[2] "that, when the priests of God read plays instead of the Gospels, and wanton bucolics instead of the Prophets, and loved to have Virgil in their hands rather than the Bible, they made a crime of pleasure, and turned the necessity of youthful exercise into a voluntary sin." Others could not relish the plain and unaffected style of Scriptures, but conversed with heathen orators to bring their language to a more polite or Attic dialect. And these also came under the censures of the Church. It is remarkable what Sozomen[3] tells us of Triphyllius, a Cyprian bishop, (who was one of these nice and delicate men, who thought the style of Scripture not so elegant as it might be made), that having occasion in a discourse before Spiridion, and some other Cyprian bishops, to cite those words of our Saviour, "Ἆρον σὺ τὸ κράββατον καὶ περιπάτει, *take up thy bed and walk*, he would not use the word, κράββατον, but instead of it put, σκίμποδα, as being a more elegant word in his opinion. To whom Spiridion with an holy indignation and zeal replied, "art thou better than him that said, κράββατον, that thou

[1] Con. Carth. iv. c. 16. Ut Episcopus gentilium libros non legat; hæreticorum autem pro necessitate et tempore. [2] Hieron. Ep. 146. ad Damasum de Filio Prodigo. tom. iii. p. 129. Sacerdotes Dei, omissis Evangeliis et Prophetis, videmus comœdias legere, amatoria bucolicorum versuum verba canere, Virgilium tenere; et id quod in pueris necessitatis est, crimen in se facere voluptatis. [3] Sozom. lib. i. c. 11.

shouldest be ashamed to use his words?" Thereby admonishing him to be a little more modest, and not give human eloquence the preference before the Holy Scriptures. Another sort of men conversed with heathen authors rather than the Scriptures, because they thought them more for their turn, to arm them with sophistry to impose their errors upon the simplicity of others. As the anonymous author in Eusebius,[1] who writes against the Theodosian heretics, observes of the leading men of that party, "that, leaving the Holy Scriptures, they generally spent their time in Euclid and Aristotle, Theophrastus and Galen; using the quirks and sophisms of infidel writers to palliate their heresy, and corrupt the simplicity of the Christian Faith." Now in all these cases, the reading of heathen authors for such unworthy ends was very disallowable, because it was always done with a manifest neglect and contempt of the Holy Scriptures, and therefore upon such grounds deservedly forbidden by the canons of the Church. But then on the other hand there were some cases, in which it was very allowable to read gentile authors, and the Church's prohibition did not extend to these. For sometimes it was necessary to read them, in order to confute and expose their errors, that others might not be infected thereby. Thus St. Jerom observes of Daniel,[2] "that he was taught in the knowledge of the Chaldæans, and Moses in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; which it was no sin to learn, so long as they did not learn it to follow it, but to censure and refute it." St. Ambrose says,[3] "he read some books that others might not read them; he read them to know their errors, and caution others against them." This was one reason, why sometimes heathen writers might be read by men of learning, in order to set a mark upon them. Another reason was, that many of them were useful and subservient to the cause of religion, either for confirming the truth of the Scriptures, and the doctrines of Christianity, or for exposing

[1] Euseb. lib. v. c. 28. [2] Hieron. Com. in Dan. c. 1. Nunquam acquiescerent discere quod non licebat. Discunt autem non ut sequantur, sed ut judicent atque convincant. [3] Ambros. Procem. in Luc. Evang. Legimus aliqua, ne legantur; legimus, ne ignoremus; legimus, non ut teneamus, sed ut repudiemus.

and refuting the errors and vanities of the heathens themselves. Thus St. Jerom observes,[1] "that both the Greek and Latin historians, such as Diodorus Siculus, Polybius, Trogus Pompeius, and Livy, are of great use as well to explain as confirm the truth of Daniel's prophecies." And St. Austin[2] says the same of the writings of Orpheus and the Sibyls, and Hermes, and other heathen philosophers, "that, as they said many things that were true both concerning God and the Son of God, they were in that respect very serviceable in refuting the vanities of the gentiles." Upon which account not only St. Austin and St. Jerom, but most of the ancient writers of the Church, were usually well versed in the learning of the gentiles, as every one knows that knows any thing of them. St. Jerom, in one short Epistle,[3] mentions the greatest part of those that lived before his own time, both Greeks and Latins, and says of them all in general, that their books are so filled with the sentences and opinions of philosophers, that it is hard to say which is most to be admired, their secular learning, or their knowledge in the Scriptures. And herein is comprised the plain state of this matter;—the clergy were obliged in the first place to be very diligent in studying the Scriptures, and after them the Canons, and approved writers of the Church, according to men's abilities, capacities, and opportunities; for the same measures could not be exacted of all. Beyond this, as there was no obligation on them to read human learning, so there was no absolute prohibition of it; but where it could be made to minister as an handmaid to divinity, and not usurp or encroach upon it, there

[1] Hieron. Prolog. in Dan. Ad intelligendas extremas partes Danielis, multiplex Græcorum historia necessaria est, &c. Et si quando cogimur literarum secularium recordari, et aliqua ex his dicere quæ olim omisimus; non nostræ est voluntatis, sed ut ita dicam, gravissimæ necessitatis. Ut probemus ea, quæ à Sanctis Prophetis ante multa secula prædicta sunt, tam Græcorum quàm Latinorum et aliarum Gentium literis contineri. [2] Aug. cont. Faust. lib. xiii. c. 15. Sibyllæ et Orpheus, et nescio quis Hermes, et si qui alii vates, vel theologi, vel sapientes, vel philosophi Gentium de Filio Dei, aut de Patre Deo vera prædixisse seu dixisse perhibentur; valet quidem aliquid ad Paganorum vanitatem revincendam. [3] Hieron. Ep. 84. ad Magnum. In tantum philosophorum doctrinis atque sententiis suos referciunt libros, ut nescias quid in illis primum admirari debeas, eruditionem secuii, an scientiam Scripturarum.

it was not only allowed, but commended and encouraged. And it must be owned, that though the abuse of secular learning does sometimes great harm, yet the study of it rightly applied did very great service to religion in the primitive ages of the Church.

SECT. 5.—Of their Piety and Devotion in their Public Addresses to God.

From their private studies pass we on next to view them in their more public capacities, as the people's orators to God, and God's embassadors to the people. In regard to which offices and character, I have showed before,[1] they were esteemed a sort of mediators in a qualified sense between God and men. In all their addresses to God as the people's orators, their great care was to offer all their sacrifices and oblations of prayer and thanksgiving in such a rational, decent, and becoming way, as best suited the nature of the action; that is, with all that gravity and seriousness, that humility and reverence, that application of mind and intenseness and fervency of devotion, as both became the greatness of that majesty to whom they addressed, and was proper for raising suitable affections in the people. This is the true meaning of that famous controverted passage in Justin Martyr's Second Apology, where, describing the service of the Church, and the manner of celebrating the eucharist, he says,[2] "the bishop sent up prayers and praises,—ὅση δύναμις,—*with the utmost of his abilities* to God." Some misconstrue this passage, and interpret the abilities of the minister officiating so as if they meant no more but his invention, expression, or the like; making it by such a gloss to become an argument against the antiquity of public liturgies, or set forms of prayer; whereas indeed it signifies here a quite different thing, viz. that spiritual vigour, or intenseness and ardency of devotion, with which the minister offered up the sacrifices of the Church to God; being such qualifications as are necessary to make our prayers and praises acceptable unto him, who requires them to be presented with all our soul and might; which may be done in set forms, as well as any other way. And so Gregory Nazianzen and Justin Martyr himself use the

[1] Book ii. chap. xix. sect. 16. [2] Justin. Apol. ii. p. 98.

phrase, ὅση δύναμις, where they speak of set forms of praising and serving God; of which more hereafter in its proper place. St. Chrysostom[1] is very earnest in recommending this same duty to the priests of God, under the name of Σπουδὴ and Εὐλάβεια, *care* and *reverence*. "With what exact care," says he, "ought he to behave himself, who goes in the name of a whole city, nay, in the name of the whole world, as their orator and embassador to intercede with God for the sins of all? But especially when he invocates the Holy Ghost, and offers up—τὴν φρικωδεστάτην θυσίαν, *the tremendous sacrifice* of the altar;—with what purity, with what reverence and piety should his tongue utter forth those words; whilst the Angels stand by him, and the whole order of heavenly Powers cries aloud, and fills the sanctuary in honour of him, who is represented as dead and lying upon the altar?" Thus that holy father argues with a warmth and zeal suitable to the subject, and such as is proper to raise our devotion, and kindle our affections into an holy flame, whenever we present the supplications of the Church on earth to the Sacred Majesty of heaven.

SECT. 6.—The Censure of such as neglected the Daily Service of the Church.

And this ardency of devotion was continually to be cherished and preserved. To which purpose the Church had her daily sacrifices, wherever it was possible to have them; and on these every clergyman was indispensibly obliged to attend; and that under pain of suspension and deprivation, whether it was his duty to officiate or not. For so the first council of Toledo determined for the Spanish Churches,[2] "that if any presbyter or deacon, or other clerk, should be in any city or country where there was a Church, and did not come to Church to the daily sacrifice or service, he should no longer be reputed one of the sacred function." The council of Agde[3] orders such to be reduced to the communion of strangers, which at least implies suspension

[1] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. vi. c. 4. [2] Con. Tolet. i. c. 5. Presbyter, Diaconus, &c. qui intra civitatem fuerit, vel in loco in quo Ecclesia est, si in Ecclesiam ad sacrificium quotidianum non venerit, Clericus non habeatur.
[3] Con. Agathens. c. 2. Clericis qui Ecclesiam frequentare, vel officium suum implere neglexerint, puregrina communio tribuatur.

from their office. And the law of Justinian[1] punishes them with degradation, because of the scandal they give to the laity by such neglects or contempts of divine service. So careful were the ancient law-givers of the Church to cut off all indecencies and abuses of this nature, and make the clergy provoking examples of piety to the people.

Sect. 7.—Rules about Preaching to Edification.

Next to their office in addressing God as the people's orators, we are to view them as God's embassadors, addressing themselves in his name to the people. Which they did by public preaching and private application; in both which their great care was to perform the duty of watchmen over God's flock, and of good stewards over his household. In their preaching, their only aim was to be the edification of the people. To which purpose the great masters of rules in this kind, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and St. Jerom, lay down these few directions. First, That the preacher be careful to make choice of an useful subject. Gregory Nazianzen[2] specifies the rule in some particular instances, such as the doctrine of the world's creation, and the soul of man; the doctrine of Providence, and the restoration of man; the two covenants; the first and second coming of Christ, his incarnation, sufferings and death; the resurrection, and end of the world, and future judgment, and different rewards of Heaven and Hell; together with the doctrine of the blessed Trinity, which is the principal article of the Christian Faith. Such subjects as these are proper for edification, to build up men in faith and holiness, and the practice of all piety and virtue.

But then, secondly, they must be treated on in a suitable way; not with too much art or loftiness of style, but with great condescension to men's capacities, who must be fed with the word as they are able to bear it. This is what Gregory Nazianzen[3] so much commends in Athanasius, when he says, "he condescended and stooped himself to the mean capacities, whilst to the acute his notions and

---

[1] Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 42. n. 10. [2] Naz. Orat. 1. de Fug. tom. i. p. 15. [3] Naz. Orat. 21. de Laud. Athan. tom. i. p. 396.

words were more sublime." St. Jerom[1] also observes upon this head, "that a preacher's discourse should always be plain, intelligible, and affecting; and rather adapted to excite men's groans and tears, by a sense of their sins, than their admiration and applause, by speaking to them what neither they, nor he himself perhaps, do truly understand. For it is ignorant and unlearned men chiefly, that affect to be admired for their speaking above the capacities of the vulgar. A bold forehead often interprets what he himself does not understand; and yet he has no sooner persuaded others to they know not what, but he assumes to himself the title of learning upon it. When yet there is nothing so easy as to deceive the ignorant multitude, who are always most prone to admire what they do not understand." Upon this account, St. Chrysostom[2] spends almost a whole book in cautioning the Christian orator against this failing; "that he should not be intent on popular applause, but with a generous mind raise himself above it; seeking chiefly to advantage his hearers, and not barely to delight and please them." To this purpose, he concludes, it would be necessary for him to despise both the applauses and censures of men, and all other things that might tempt him rather to flatter his hearers, than edify them. "In a word,[3] his chief end in all his composures should be to please God: and then, if he also gained the praise of men, he might receive it; if not, he needed not to court it, nor torment himself that it was denied him. For it would be consolation enough for all his labours, that in adapting his doctrine and eloquence he had always sought to please his God."

Thirdly, A third rule given in this case, was, "that men should apply their doctrine and spiritual medicines according to the emergent and most urgent necessities of their hearers. Which was the most proper duty of a watchman, to perceive with a quick eye, where the greatest danger lay; which was men's weakest and most unguarded side; and

---

[1] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. Docente te in Ecclesiâ, non clamor populi, sed gemitus suscitetur; lachrymæ auditorum laudes tuæ sint. - - - - Celeritate dicendi apud imperitum vulgus admirationem sui facere indoctorum hominum est. Attrita frons interpretatur sæpe quod nescit; et cùm aliis persuaserit, sibi quoque usurpat scientiam. [2] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. v. c. 1.
Ibid. c. 7.

then apply suitable remedies to their maladies and distempers." St. Chrysostom[1] in speaking of this part of a minister's duty, says, "he should be νηφάλιος ἢ θεωρητικὸς, watchful and perspicacious, and have a thousand eyes about him, as living not for himself alone, but for a multitude of people. To live retired in a cell is the business of a monk; but the duty of a watchman is to converse among men of all degrees and callings; to take care of the body of Christ, the Church, and have regard both to its health and beauty; curiously observing, lest any spot or wrinkle or other defilement should sully the grace and comeliness of it. Now this obliged spiritual physicians to apply their medicines, that is, their doctrines, as the maladies of their patients chiefly required; to be most earnest and frequent in encountering those errors and vices, which were most reigning, or which men were most in danger of being infected by." And this is the reason, why in the homilies of the Ancients we so often meet with discourses against such heresies, as the world now knows nothing of; such as those of the Marcionites and Manichees, and many others, which it would be absurd to combat now in popular discourses; but then it was necessary to be done, because they were the prevailing heresies of the age, and men were in danger of being subverted by them. And it is further observable, that the most formidable heresies, and prevailing factions, such as that of the Arians, when armed with secular power, could never either force or court the Catholic preachers into silence, to let the wolves devour the sheep by such a tame and base compliance. In this case no worldly motives could prevail with them, when they saw the danger, not to give warning of it. They thought they could not otherwise answer the character of watchmen, and stewards of the mysteries of God, since it was required in stewards that a man be found faithful.

SECT. 8.—Of Fidelity, Diligence, and Prudence, in Private Addresses and Applications.

But their fidelity was not only expressed in their public discourses, but also in their private addresses and applications to men, who had either cut themselves off from the

[1] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. iii. c. 12. Lib. iv. c. 2 et 3.

body of Christ by heresies and schisms, or by their sins made themselves unsound members of the body, whilst they seemed to continue of it. With what fidelity and meekness and diligence they addressed themselves to the former sort, we may learn from the good effects, which their applications often had upon them. Theodoret[1] tells of himself in one place, that he had converted a thousand souls from the heresy of the Marcionites, and many others from the heresies of Arius and Eunomius, in his own diocese. And in another place[2] he augments the number of converted Marcionites to ten thousand, whom, with indefatigable industry, in a diocese of forty miles in length and breadth, containing eight hundred Churches in it, he had reduced from their strayings to the unity of the Catholic Church. What wonders also St. Austin wrought in Afric upon the Donatists and others the same way, by private letters and conferences and collations with them, the reader may learn from Possidius,[3] the author of his life, who frequently mentions his labours in this kind, and the great advantage that accrued to the Church by these means. For he lived to see the greatest part of the Manichees, Donatists, Pelagians, and Pagans converted to the Catholic Church. They were no less careful to apply themselves in private to persons within the Church, as occasion required. And here great art and prudence, as well as fidelity and diligence, was necessary to give success to their endeavours. "For mankind," as Nazianzen observes,[4] is so various and uncertain a sort of creature, that it requires the greatest art and skill to manage him. For the tempers of men's minds differ more than the features and lineaments of their bodies; and, as all meats and medicines are not proper for all bodies, so neither is the same treatment and discipline proper for all souls. Some are best moved by words, others by examples; some are of a dull and heavy temper, and so have need of the spur to exstimulate them; others that are brisk and fiery, have more need of the curb to restrain them. Praise works best upon some, and reproof upon others, provided each of them be ministered in a suitable and seasonable way; otherwise

[1] Theod. Ep. 113. ad. Leon. [2] Id. Ep. 145. p. 1026. [3] Possid. Vit. Aug. c. ix. 13, 18. [4] Naz. Orat. 1. de Fug. p. 14.

they do more harm than good. Some men are drawn by gentle exhortations to their duty; others by rebukes and hard words must be driven to it. And even in the business of reproof, some are affected most with open rebuke, others with private. For some men never regard a secret reproof, who yet are easily corrected, if chastised in public. Others again cannot bear a public disgrace, but grow either morose, or impudent and implacable upon it; who, perhaps, would have hearkened to a secret admonition, and repaid their monitor with their conversion, as presuming him to have accosted them out of mere pity and love. Some men are to be so nicely watched and observed, that not the least of their faults are to be dissembled; because they seek to hide their sins from men, and arrogate to themselves thereupon the praise of being politic and crafty: in others it is better to wink at some faults, so that seeing we will not see, and hearing we will not hear, lest by too frequent chidings we bring them to despair, and so make them cast off modesty, and grow bolder in their sins. To some men we must put on an angry countenance, and seem to contemn them, and despair of them as lost and deplorable wretches, when their nature so requires it; others, again, must be treated with meekness and humility, and be recovered to a better hope by more promising and encouraging prospects. Some men must be always conquered, and never yielded to, whilst to others it will be better sometimes to concede a little. For all men's distempers are not to be cured the same way; but proper medicines are to be applied, as the matter itself, or occasion, or the temper of the patient will admit of. And this is the most difficult part of the pastoral office, to know how to distinguish these things nicely, with an exact judgment, and with as exact a hand to minister suitable remedies to every distemper. It is a master-piece of art, which is not to be perfectly attained but by good observation, joined with experience and practice." What our author thus here at large discourses by way of rule and theory, he in another place sums up more briefly in the example of the great Athanasius, whose pattern he proposes to men's imitation, as a living image of this admirable prudence and dexterity in dealing with men according to this great variety

of tempers; telling us,[1] "that his design was always one and the same, but his methods various; praising some, moderately correcting others; using the spur to some dull tempers, and the reins to others of a more hot and zealous spirit; in his conversation, master of the greatest simplicity, but in his government master of the greatest artifice and variety of skill; wise in his discourses, but much wiser in his understanding, to adapt himself according to the different capacities and tempers of men." Now the design of all this was, not to give any latitude or license to sin, but by all prudent and honest arts to discourage and destroy it. It was not to teach the clergy the base and servile arts of flattery and compliance; to become time-servers and men-pleasers, and sooth the powerful or the rich in their errors and vices; but only to instruct them in the different methods of opposing sin, and how, by joining prudence to their zeal, they might make their own authority most venerable, and most effectually promote the true ends of religion. St. Chrysostom puts in this caution, in describing this part of a bishop's character. "He ought to be wise, as well as holy; a man of great experience, and one that understands the world: and, because his business is with all sorts of men, he should be—ποικίλος—one that can appear with different aspects, and act with great variety of skill." "But when I say this, I do not mean," says he,[2] "that he should be a man of craft, or servile flattery, or a dissembling hypocrite; but a man of great freedom and boldness, who knows notwithstanding how to condescend and stoop himself for men's advantage, when occasion requires, and can be as well mild as austere. For all men are not to be treated in the same way: no physician uses the same method with all his patients." The true mean and decorum, he thinks, which a bishop should observe in his converse and applications to men, is to keep between too much stiffness and abjectness. "He must be grave without pride;[3] awful, but courteous; majestic, as a man of authority and power, yet

[1] Naz. Orat. 21. de Laud. Athan. p. 396. [2] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. vi. c. 4. Ποικίλον αὐτὸν εἶναι δεῖ. ποικίλον δὲ λέγω, οὐχ ὕπουλον, οὐ κόλακα, οὐκ ὑποκριτὴν, &c. [3] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. iii. c. 16.

affable and communicative to all. Of an integrity that cannot be corrupted, yet officious and ready to serve every man; humble, but not servile; sharp and resolute, but yet gentle and mild. By such prudence he will maintain his authority, and carry any point with men, whilst he studies to do every thing without hatred or favour, only for the benefit and edification of the Church." We must reduce to this head of prudence, in making proper address and application to offenders, that direction given by St. Paul, and repeated in several ancient canons, that a bishop be no smiter,—μὴ πλήκτην,—which the twenty-seventh of those called the Apostolical Canons thus paraphrases: "If any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, smite either an offending Christian, or an injurious heathen, we order him to be deposed. For our Lord did not teach us this discipline, but the contrary; for he was smitten, but did not smite any; when he was reviled, he reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not." Justinian forbids the same in one of his Novels,[1] as a thing unbecoming the priests of God, to smite any man with their own hands. The word, πλήσσειν, signifies also smiting with the tongue, by reproachful, bitter, and contumelious language, as St. Chrysostom, St. Jerom, and others, understand it. In which sense also it was forbidden, as a thing indecent, and unbecoming the gravity and prudence of the Christian clergy.

SECT. 9.—Of Prudence and Candour in composing unnecessary Controversies in the Church.

St. Chrysostom enlarges upon several other parts of prudence, which I need not here insist upon, because they have either already been mentioned, or will hereafter be considered in other places; such as prudence[2] in opposing heresies; prudence[3] in managing the virgins and widows, and the revenues of the Church; prudence[4] in hearing and determining secular causes; and prudence[5] in the exercise of discipline and Church-censures, which last will be

[1] Just. Novel. 123. c. 11. Sed neque propriis manibus liceat Episcopo quenquam percutere: hoc enim alienum est a Sacerdotibus. [2] Chrys. de Sacerd. lib. iv. c. 4. [3] Ibid. lib. iii. c. 16. [4] Ibid. lib. iii. c. 18. [5] Ibid. lib. iii. c. 18.

spoken to under another head. I shall here therefore only add one instance more of their prudence in allaying unnecessary disputes, which rose among Catholics, and men of the same opinion in the Church, which indeed was rather a complication of many noble virtues: prudence, candour, ingenuity, moderation, peaceableness, and charity, joined together, which like a constellation of the brightest qualities always shined with the greatest lustre. This is what Gregory Nazianzen chiefly admired in the conduct of Athanasius, and therefore he gives it the highest commendation and preference before all his other virtues, as thinking there was no one thing whereby he did greater service to the Church of God. It happened in the time of Athanasius, that the Catholics were like to be divided about mere words; a warm dispute asising about what names the three divine persons were to be called by, some were for calling them only Τρία Πρόσωπα, *Three Persons*, to avoid Arianism; others called them Τρεῖς Ὑποστάσεις, *Three Hypostases*, to avoid Sabellianism. Now they all meant the same thing, but not understanding each others terms, they mutually charged one another with the heresies of Arius and Sabellius. The one party in the heat of disputation could understand nothing by Three Hypostases but three subtances or essences in the Arian sense; for they made no distinction between hypostasis and essence, and therefore charged their opposites with Arianism. The other party were afraid that Τρία Πρόσωπα signified no more than nominal persons, in the sense of Sabellius, who himself had used those very terms in an equivocal sense to impose upon the vulgar, and therefore they inveighed against their adversaries as designing to promote Sabellianism. "And so," says Nazianzen,[1] "this little difference in words making a noise as if there had been difference in opinion, the love of quarreling and contention fomenting the dispute, the ends of the earth were in danger of being divided by a few syllables. Which when Athanasius, the true man of God, and great guide of souls, both saw and heard, he could not endure to think of so absurd, and unreasonable a division among

[1] Naz. Orat. 21. de Laud. Athan. tom. i. p. 396.

the professors of the same faith, but immediately applied a remedy to the distemper. And how did he make his application? having convened both parties with all meekness and humility, and accurately weighed the intention and meaning of the words on both sides, after he found them agreeing in the things themselves, and not in the least differing in point of doctrine, he ended their dispute, allowing the use of both names, and tying them to unity of opinion." "This," says our author, "was a more advantageous act of charity to the Church, than all his other daily labours and discourses; it was more honourable than all his watchings and humicubations, and not inferior to his applauded flights and exiles." And therefore he tells his readers in ushering in the discourse, "that he could not omit the relation, without injuring them, especially at a time when contentions and divisions were in the Church; for this action of his would be an instruction to them, that were then alive, and of great advantage, if they would propound it to their own imitation; since men were prone to divide not only from the impious, but from the orthodox and pious, and that not only about little and contemptible opinions, which ought to make no difference, but about words, that tended to one and the same sense." The caution is of use in all ages; and had it always been strictly observed, it would have prevented many wild disputes, and fierce contentions about words in the Christian Church.

SECT. 10.—Of their Zeal and Courage in Defending the Truth.

But now we are to observe on the other hand, that as they were eminent for their candour and prudence in composing unnecessary and verbal disputes; so, where the cause was weighty, and any material point of religion concerned, they were no less famous for their zeal and courage, in standing up in the defence of truth against all opposers. It was neither the artifice and subtlety, nor the power and malice of their enemies could make them yield, where they thought the faith was in danger to be destroyed. "In other cases," says Nazianzen,[1] "there is nothing so peaceable, so

[1] Naz. Orat. 21. de Laud. Athan. p. 388. Οἱ κἂν τἆλλα ὦσιν εἰρηνικοί τε ἢ

noderate as Christian bishops but in this case they cannot ear the name of moderation, to betray their God by silence nd sitting still; but here they are exceeding eager warriors, nd fighting champions, that are not to be overcome." He loes not mean, that the weapons of their warfare were arnal; that they used any pious frauds, or plotted treasons r rebellions, or took up arms in defence of religion; but hat with an undaunted courage and brave resolution they tood up firm in defence of truth, and mattered not what ames they were called by, contentious, unpeaceable, immoderate, factious, turbulent, incendiaries, or any thing of he like nature, nor yet what they suffered in any kind, whilst they contended for that faith, which was once delivered to the saints. Church-history abounds with instances of this nature; but it will be sufficient to exemplify the practice of this virtue in a single instance, which Gregory Nazianzen[1] gives us in the Life of St. Basil, where he relates a famous dialogue that passed between Modestus, the Arian governor under Valens, and that holy man. Modestus tried all arts to bring him over to the party, but, finding all in vain, he at last threatened him with severity. "What?" said he, "dost thou not fear this power, which I am armed with?" "why should I fear?" said Basil, "what canst thou do, or what can I suffer?" "what canst thou suffer?" said the other, "many things that are in my power; confiscation of thy goods, banishment, torment, and death." "But thou must threaten me with something else," said Basil, "if thou canst, for none of these things can touch me. As for confiscation of goods, I am not liable to it; for I have nothing to lose, unless thou wantest these tattered and threadbare garments, and a few books, which is all the estate I am possessed of. For banishment, I know not what it means, for I am tied to no place; I shall esteem every country as much my own, as that were I now dwell; for the whole earth is the Lord's, and I am only a pilgrim and a stranger in it. As for torments, what can they do to him, who has not

---

μέτριοι, τοῦτό γε οὐ φύσιν ἐπιεικεῖς εἶναι, Θεὸν προδιδόναι διὰ τῆς ἡσυχίας ἀλλὰ, ἀλίαν εἰσὶν ἐνταῦθα πολεμικοί τε καὶ δύσμαχοι. [1] Naz. Orat. 20. de Laud. Basil, p. 340.

a body that can hold out beyond the first stroke? and for death, it will be a kindness to me, for it will but so much the sooner send me unto God, to whom I live and do the duty of my station; being in a great measure already dead, and now of a long time hastening unto him." The governor was strangely surprised at this discourse, and said, "no man ever talked at this free and bold rate to Modestus before." "Perhaps," said Basil, "thou didst never meet with a bishop before; for, if thou hadst, he would have talked just as I do, when he was put to contend about such matters as these. In other things we are mild and yielding, and the humblest men on earth, as our laws oblige us to be; we are so far from showing ourselves supercilious or haughty to magistrates in power, that we do not do it to persons of the meanest rank and condition. But, when the cause of God is concerned, or in danger, then indeed we esteem all other things as nothing, and fix our eyes only upon him. Then fire and sword, wild beasts, and instruments of torture to tear off our flesh, are so far from being a terror, that they are rather a pleasure, and recreation to us. Therefore reproach and threaten us, do your pleasure, use your power to the utmost, and let the emperor know all this: yet you shall never conquer us, or bring us to assent to your impious doctrine, though you threaten us ten thousand times more than all this." The governor hearing this, and finding him to be a man of invincible and inflexible courage, dismissed him now not with threatenings, but with a sort of reverence and submission, and went and told the emperor, that the bishop of that Church was too hard for them all; for his courage was so great, his resolution so firm, that neither promises nor threatenings could move him from his purpose. Nor was it only open violence they thus bravely resisted, but also the more crafty attempts of the enemies of truth, who many times went artificially to work against it; partly by blackening the characters of its champions and defenders, and representing them as base and intolerable men; and partly by smoothing their own character, and pretending unity in faith with the orthodox, and that their designs were only designs of peace, to remove unscriptural words and novel terms out of the way, that all

men might be of the same opinion. These were the two grand artifices of the Arian party, whereby the leading and politic men among them, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Valens, Ursacius, and others, always laboured to overthrow the truth. Upon this account Athanasius was forced to undergo a thousand calumnies and slanderous reproaches; he was accused to Constantine, as one that assumed to himself imperial authority to impose a tax upon Egypt; as one guilty of murder in cutting off the hand of Arsenius, a Meletian bishop, as guilty of treason in siding with Philumenus, the rebel, and furnishing him with money; as an enemy to the public for attempting to hinder the transportation of corn from Egypt to Constantinople: which accusation so far prevailed upon the emperor, that he banished him to Triers upon it. In the next reign he was accused again of repeated murders; and of sacrilege, in diverting Constantine's liberality to the widows of Egypt and Libya to other uses; of treason, in joining interest with Magnentius, the tyrant; and many other such charges were spitefully and diabolically levelled against him. St. Basil was likewise variously accused both by professed enemies and pretended friends; who, as is usual in such cases, brought charges against him directly contrary to one another. Some accused him of tritheism, for defending the doctrine of Three Hypostases against the Sabellians; others, of Semiarianism, or heterodoxy in the article about the divinity of the Holy Ghost, because in his Church he sometimes used a different form of doxology from what was used in other Churches. Some again accused him of Arianism, because he had received Eustathius of Sebastia into communion upon his professing the Catholic faith; others said, he communicated with Apollinaris, the heretic, because upon some occasions he wrote letters to him. Thus were two of the greatest and best of men maliciously traduced and wounded in their reputation; both indeed for the same cause, but with this difference, that the one was prosecuted by open enemies without the Church, the other chiefly by secret enemies within; of whom therefore he had reason to take up the prophet's complaint, and say, "These are the wounds, with which I was wounded in the house of my friends." And these were such temptations

as might have unsettled any weak and wavering minds, and made them turn their backs upon religion: but true zeal is above temptation, and can equally despise the wounds of the sword, and the wounds of the tongue; having always the consolation, which Christ gives in his Gospel, ready at hand to support it, "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven." Such examples show us, that innocence itself cannot always exempt men from calumny, but sometimes is accidentally the occasion of it. But then it has this advantage, that being joined with a suitable zeal, it never sinks under the weight and pressure of its burden, but always comes off conqueror at the last, as we see in the instances now before us.

The other artifice, which I said the Arians used to destroy the Faith, was the specious pretence of peace and unity. The politic and crafty men among them in the time of Constantius pretended, that they had no quarrel with the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity itself, but only were aggrieved at the novel, and unscriptural words, such as the Ὁμοούσιον, *consubstantial, &c.* which the council of Nice had used to express it by. These, they said, were dividing terms, and the cause of all the quarrel and combustion: and therefore they still urged the removing these terms, as the great stumbling-block, out of the way, that the peace and unity of the Church might follow upon it. But Athanasius and other wise Catholics easily perceived, whither this sly stratagem tended; being very sensible, that their design was not against the bare terms, but the Faith itself, and therefore they always stoutly and zealously opposed it. Nor could the Arians ever gain this point upon the Catholics, till at last in the council of Ariminum, Anno 359, by great importunity, and clamours for unity and peace, they were prevailed upon to sink the word, consubstantial, and draw up a new creed without it, yet, as they thought, containing the very same doctrine, and in as full terms as could be expressed, save that the word, consubstantial, was not in it. But here it must be owned, these Catholic bishops were wanting in their zeal, as they themselves were quickly

after convinced. For no sooner was this concession made, but the Arians immediately gave out and boasted over all the world, that the Nicene faith was condemned, and Arianism established in a general-council, though nothing was less intended by the Catholic bishops, that were present at it. But now they were sensible they had made a false step, by suffering themselves thus to be imposed upon by designing men: they now saw, that they ought to have stuck to the Nicene terms, as well as the Faith, since the Faith itself so much depended on them. They now began to complain of the fraud, and asked pardon of their brethren for their want of foresight and caution, in a case so tender and material. St. Jerom, who gives us this account of the whole transaction, from the Acts of the synod and other records extant in his time, brings them in making this apology for themselves: "the bishops," says he,[1] "who had been imposed upon by fraud at Ariminum, and who were reputed heretics without being conscious to themselves of any heresy, went about every where protesting by the body of Christ, and all that is sacred in the Church, that they suspected no evil in their creed: they thought the sense had agreed with the words, and that men had not meant one thing in their hearts, and uttered another thing with their lips. They were deceived by entertaining too good an opinion of base and evil men. They did not suppose the priests of Christ could so treacherously have fought against Christ. In short, they lamented their mistake now with tears, and offered to condemn as well their own subscription, as all the Arian blasphemies." Any one, that reads St. Jerom carefully, will easily perceive, that these bishops were no Arians, nor ever intended to subscribe an Arian creed; but their fault was want of zeal in

[1] Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. tom. ii. p. 143. Concurrebant Episcopi, qui Arimineusibus dolis irretiti, sine conscientiâ hæretici ferebantur, contestantes corpus Domini, et quicquid in Ecclesiâ sanctum est, se nihil mali in suâ Fide suspicatos. "Putavimus," aiebant, "sensum congruere cum verbis; nec in Ecclesiis ubi simplicitas, ubi pura confessio est, aliud in corde clausum esse, aliud in labiis proferri timuimus. Decepit nos bona de malis existimatio. Non sumus arbitrati sacerdotes Christi adversus Christum pugnare." Multaque alia quæ brevitatis studio prætereo, flentes asserebant, parati et subscriptionem pristinam et omnes Arianorum blasphemias condemnare.

parting with the Nicene creed, to take another instead of it without the word, consubstantial; which though they subscribed in the simplicity of their hearts as an orthodox creed, (and indeed the words, as St. Jerom describes them, in their plain sense are sound and orthodox, as St. Jerom says in their excuse,) yet the Arians put an equivocal and poisonous sense upon them; giving out, after the council was ended, that they had not only abolished the word, consubstantial, but with it condemned the Nicene faith also. Which was strange surprising news to the bishops, that had been at Ariminum. "Then," says St. Jerom, "*ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est,—the whole world groaned, and was amazed to think she should be reputed Arian.*" That is, the Catholic bishops of the whole world, for there were three hundred of them present at that council, were amazed to find themselves so abused, and represented as Arians, when they never intended in the least to confirm the Arian doctrine. But now by this the reader will be able to judge, what kind of zeal the Catholic Church required then in her clergy, viz. That they should not only contend for the Faith itself, but also for those catholic forms and ways of expressing it, which had been prudently composed and settled in general-councils, as a barrier against heretics; the giving up of which to subtle and dangerous adversaries, would always give them advantage to make fiercer attacks upon the Faith itself, and prove destructive to the catholic cause; as those bishops found by woeful experience, who were concerned in the concession made at Ariminum. It is candour indeed, when good Catholics are divided only about words, to bring them to a right understanding of one another, which will set them at peace and unity again: but it is tameness to give up the main bulwarks of the Faith to fallacious adversaries and designing men, whose arts and aims, however disguised, are always known to strike at the foundation of religion. And therefore, though no man was ever more candid than Athanasius towards mistaken Catholics, yet neither was any more zealous in opposing the arts and stratagems of the Arian party; always sticking close to the definition of the

Nicene council, and never yielding, that any tittle or syllable of that creed should be erased or altered.

SECT. II.—Of their Obligations to maintain the Unity of the Church; and of the Censure of such as fell into Heresy or Schism.

WHILST I am upon this head, I cannot but take notice of the obligations the clergy lay under to maintain the unity of the Church, both in faith and discipline, and what penalties were inflicted on such as made a breach therein, whether by falling into heresy or schism themselves, or giving encouragement to them in others. I shall not need to state the nature of Church-unity and communion in this place any further, than by saying,—that, to maintain the purity of the Catholic Faith, and live under the discipline and government of a Catholic bishop, who himself lived in communion with the Catholic Church, were then as it were the two characteristic notes of any man's being in the communion of the Church; and therefore, as every member was obliged to maintain the unity of the Church in both these parts, so much more the clergy, who were to be the chief guardians of it. And if they failed in either kind, that is, if they lapsed either into heresy or schism, by the laws of the Church they were to be deposed from their office; and though they repented and returned to the unity of the Church again, yet they were not to act in their former station, but to be admitted to communicate only in the quality of laymen. This was the rule of the African Church in the time of Cyprian, as appears from the Synodical Epistle[1] of the council of Carthage, to which his name is prefixed. For, writing to Pope Stephen, they tell him, their custom was to treat such of the clergy as were ordained in the Catholic Church, and afterward stood up perfidiously and rebelliously against the Church, in the same manner as they did those that were first ordained by heretics; that is, they admitted them to the

[1] Cypr. Ep. 72. p. 197. Si qui Presbyteri aut Diaconi qui vel in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ prius ordinati fuerint, et postmodum perfidi ac rebelles contra Ecclesiam steterint, vel apud Hæreticos à Pseudo-Episcopis et Antichristis contra Christi dispositionem profanâ ordinatione promoti sunt - - - eos quoque hac conditione suscipi cùm revertuntur, ut communicent Laici, et satis habeant quod admittuntur ad pacem, qui hostes pacis extiterint, &c.

peace of the Church, and allowed them the communion of laymen, but did not permit them to officiate again in any order of the clergy. And this, he says, they did to put a mark of distinction between those that always stood true to the Church, and those that deserted it. Yet if any considerable advantage accrued to the Church, by the return of such an heretic or schismatic, as if he brought over any considerable part of the deluded people with him; or if he was generally chosen by the Church, or the like; in such cases the rule was so far dispensed with, that the deserter might be admitted to his pristine dignity, and be allowed to officiate in his own order again. Upon this account, Cornelius, bishop of Rome, received Maximus, the presbyter, to his former honour upon his return from the Novatian schism.[1] And in after ages both the Novatians and Meletians were particularly favoured with this privilege by the council of Nice, and the Donatists by the African fathers in the time of St. Austin, as I have had occasion to note more than once before.[2] But if they continued obstinate in their heresy or schism, then many times an anathema was pronounced against them, as in the second council of Carthage. "If a presbyter," says the canon,[3] "that is reproved or excommunicated by his bishop, being puffed up with pride, shall presume to offer the oblation in a separate assembly, or set up another altar against him, let him be anathema." The council of Antioch,[4] and those called the Apostolical Canons,[5] have several decrees of the like nature. Yea, so careful were the clergy to be of the unity of the Church, that they were not to give any encouragement to heretics, or schismatics, or excommunicated persons, by communicating with them in prayer or other holy offices of the Church, or so much as frequenting their society, feasting with them or the like. But I do not enlarge upon these

---

[1] Cornel. Ep. 46. al. 49. ad Cypr. p. 93. Maximum Presbyterum locum suum agnoscere jussimus. See other instances in Socrates, lib. vii. c. 3.

[2] Book iv. chap. vii. sect. 7 and 8. [3] Con. Carth. 2. c. viii. Si quis forte Presbyter ab Episcopo suo correptus vel excommunicatus, tumore vel superbiâ inflatus, putaverit separatim Deo sacrificia offerenda, vel aliud erigendum altare—Anathema sit. [4] Con. Antioch. c. 4 et 5. [5] Canon. Apost. c. 32.

things here, because being matters of discipline, they will come again to be considered under that head in another place.

I have now gone through some of the chief general duties, which more immediately concerned the office and function of the clergy; and by mixing public rules with private directions and great examples, have made such an essay towards the idea and character of a primitive clerk, as may, I hope, in some things excite both the emulation and curiosity of many of my readers, who may be concerned to imitate the pattern I have been describing. If here it be not drawn so full, or so exactly to the life in all its beauties as they could wish, they will find their account in satisfying their curiosity, by having recourse to the fountains themselves, from whence these materials were taken. For many things, that might here have been added, were purposely omitted for fear of drawing out this part of the discourse to a greater length than would consist with the design and measures of the present undertaking. And I had rather be thought to have said too little, than too much, upon this head, that I might not cloy, but leave an edge upon the appetite of the inquisitive reader.

CHAP. IV.

An Account of some other Laws and Rules, which were a Sort of Out-Guards and Fences to the former.

SECT. I.—No Clergyman allowed to desert or relinquish his Station without just Grounds and Leave.

HAVING thus far discoursed both of such laws, as related to the life and conversation of the primitive clergy, and of those that more immediately concerned the duties and offices of their function; I come now to speak of a third sort of laws, which were like the Jew's *Sepimenta Legis*, a sort of by-laws and rules, made for the defence and guard of the two former. Among these we may reckon such laws as were made to fix the clergy to their proper business and calling; such as that, which forbad any clergyman to desert

or relinquish his station, without just grounds or leave granted by his superiors. In the African Church, as has been showed before,[1] from the time that any man was made a reader, or entered in any of the lower orders of the Church, he was presumed to be dedicated to the service of God, so as thenceforth not to be at liberty to turn secular again at his own pleasure. And much more did this rule hold for bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Therefore Cyril of Alexandria, as he is cited by Harmenopulus,[2] says in one of his canons, "that it was contrary to the laws of the Church for any priest to give in a libel of resignation: for, if he be worthy, he ought to continue in his ministry; if he be unworthy, he should not have the privilege of resigning, but be condemned and ejected." The council of Chalcedon[3] orders all such to be anathematized, "as forsook their orders to take upon them any military office or secular dignity, unless they repented and returned to the employment, which, for God's sake, they had first chosen." The council of Tours,[4] in like manner, decrees, "that whoever of the clergy desert their order and office, to follow a secular life and calling again, shall be punished with excommunication. The civil law was also very severe upon such deserters. By an order of Arcadius and Honorius[5] they are condemned to serve *in Curia* all their lives, that they might never have the privilege of resuming the clerical life again. And by a law of Justinian's,[6] both monks and clerks, so deserting, were to forfeit whatever estate they were possessed of, to the church or monastery to which they belonged.

---

[1] Book iii. chap. i. sect. 5. [2] Harmenopul. Epitom. Can. ap. Leunclav. Jus. Græc. Rom. tom. i. p. 11. Παρὰ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς θεσμὰς, τὸ λιβέλλους παραιτήσεων προσάγειν τινὰς τῶν ἱερουργῶν, &c. [3] Con. Chalced. c. 7. Τὰς ἅπαξ ἐν κλήρῳ τεταγμένους, μήτε ἐπὶ τραπεζίαν μήτε ἐπὶ αξίαν κοσμικὴν ἔρχεσθαι, &c. [4] Con. Turon. c. 5. Si quis Clericus, relicto officii sui ordine, laicam voluerit agere vitam, vel se militiæ tradiderit, excommunicationis pœnâ feriatur. [5] Cod. Th. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 39. Si qui professum sacræ religionis sponte dereliquerit, continuò sibi eum Curia vindicet: ut liber illi ultra ad Ecclesiam recursus esse non possit.
[6] Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 55. Quod si illi monasteria aut Ecclesias relinquant, atque mundani fiant: omne ipsorum jus ad monasterium aut ecclesiam pertinet.

SECT. 2.—Yet in some Cases a Resignation was allowed of.

But this rule, as it was intended for the benefit of the Church, to keep the clergy to their duty, so when the benefit of the Church, or any other reasonable cause required the contrary, might be dispensed with; and we find many such resignations or renunciations practised, and some allowed by general councils. For not to mention the case of disability by reason of old age, sickness, or other infirmity, in which it was usual for bishops to turn over their business to a coadjutor; of which I have given a full account in a former book;[1] there were two other cases, which come nearer to the matter in hand. One was, when a bishop, through the obstinacy, hatred, or disgust of any people found himself incapable of doing them any service, and that the burthen was an intolerable oppression to him; in that case, if he desired to renounce, his resignation was accepted. Thus Gregory Nazianzen renounced the see of Constantinople, and betook himself to a private life, because the people grew factious, and murmured at him, as being a stranger. And this he did with the consent and approbation of the general-council of Constantinople, as not only the historians, Theodoret[2] and Socrates,[3] but he himself[4] testifies in many places of his writings. After the same manner, Theodoret says,[5] Meletius, the famous bishop of Antioch, when he was bishop of Sebastia, in Armenia, was so offended with the rebellious temper and contumacy of a perverse and froward people, that he abandoned them, and retired likewise to a private life. So Theodorus Lector[6] tells us, how Martyrius, bishop of Antioch, being offended at the factiousness of his people and clergy, upon the intrusion of Peter Fullo, renounced his Church with these words: "a contumacious clergy, a rebellious people, a prophane Church, I bid adieu to them all, reserving to myself the dignity of priesthood." Another case was, when in charity a bishop resigned, or showed himself willing to

[1] Book ii. chap. xiii. sect. 4. [2] Theod. lib. v. c. 8. [3] Socrat. lib. v. c. 7. [4] Naz. Orat. 32. It. Carm. de Vitâ suâ. [5] Theod. lib. ii. c. 31. [6] Theodor. Lect. lib. i. p. 555.

resign, to cure some inveterate schism. Thus Chrysostom[1] told his people, "that, if they had any suspicion of him, as if he were an usurper, he was ready to quit his government, when they pleased, if that was necessary to preserve the unity of the Church." And so Theodoret tells us,[2] that, in the dispute between Flavian and Evagrius, the two bishops of Antioch, when Theodosius, the emperor, sent for Flavian, and ordered him to go and have his cause decided at Rome, he bravely answered, "Great Sire, if any accuse my faith as erroneous, or my life as unqualifying me for a bishopric, I will freely let my accusers be my judges, and stand to their sentence, whatever it be; but if the dispute be only about the throne and government of the Church, I shall not stay for judgment, nor contend with any, that has a mind to it, but freely recede, and abdicate the throne of my own accord. And you, sire, may commit the see of Antioch to whom you please." The emperor looked upon this as a noble and generous answer, and was so affected with it, that instead of obliging him to go to Rome, he sent him home again, and bad him go feed the Church committed to his care; nor would he ever after hearken to the bishops of Rome, though they often solicited him to expel him. There is one instance more of this nature, which I cannot omit, because it is such an example of self-denial, and despising of private interest for the public good, and peace, and unity of the Church, as deserves to be transmitted to posterity, and to be spoken of with the highest commendations. It was the proposal, which Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, and St. Austin, with the rest of the African bishops, made to the Donatists, at the opening of the conference of Carthage;[3] that, to put an end to the schism, wherever there was a Catholic and a Donatist bishop in the same city, they should both of them resign, and suffer a new one to be chosen. "For why," say they, "should we scruple to offer the

[1] Chrys. Hom. 11. in Ephes. p. 1110. Ἕτοιμοι παραχωρῆσαι τῆς ἀρχῆς, μόνον ἐκκλησία ἔστω μία. [2] Theod. lib. v. c. 23. [3] Collat. Carth. Die i. c. 16. Utrique de medio secedamus - - - quid enim dubitemus Redemptori nostro sacrificium istius humilitatis offerre? An verò ille de cœlis in membra humana descendit, ut membra ejus essemus? Et nos, ne ipsa ejus membra crudeli divisione lanientur, de cathedris descendere formidamus? &c.

sacrifice of such an humility to our Redeemer? Did he descend from heaven to assume our nature, and make us his members? And shall we make any doubt to descend from our chairs, to prevent his members being torn to pieces by a cruel schism? We bishops are ordained for the people of Christ. What therefore is most conducive to the peace of Christian people, we ought to do in reference to our episcopacy. If we be profitable servants, why should we envy the eternal gain of our Lord for our own temporal honours? Our episcopal dignity will be so much the more advantageous to us, if by laying it aside we gather together the flock of Christ, than if we disperse his flock by retaining it. And with what face can we hope for the honour which Christ has promised us in the world to come, if our honours in this world hinder the unity of his Church." By this we see there were some cases, in which it was lawful for men to renounce even the episcopal office, and betake themselves to a private life; the grand rule being in these and all other cases, to do what was most for the benefit and edification of the Church, and sacrifice private interest to the advantage of the public.

SECT. 3.—And Canonical Pensions sometimes granted in such Cases.

In these cases, a bishop after he had renounced was not to intermeddle with the affairs of the Church, to ordain, or perform any offices of the like nature, unless he was called to assist by some other bishop, or was commissioned by him as his delegate; yet he was allowed the title, and honour, and communion of a bishop, as the general council of Ephesus[1] determined it should be, in the case of Eustathius, bishop of Perga and metropolitan of Pamphylia, who had renounced his bishopric, being an aged man, and thinking himself unable to discharge the duties of it. In such cases likewise, when any one receded with the approbation of a council, he was sometimes allowed to receive a moderate pension out of the bishopric for his maintenance. As it was

[1] Con. Ephes. Act. 7. in Epist. ad Synod. Pamphyliæ. Habeat Episcopi nomen et honorem ac communionem, sic quidem ut neque ipse ordinet, neque in ecclesiam propriâ auctoritate ordinaturus veniat, nisi forte consumatur, &c.

in the case of Domnus, bishop of Antioch, who having been ejected, though unjustly, by Dioscorus in the second synod of Ephesus, yet quietly resigned the bishopric to Maximus; upon which account Maximus desired leave of the council of Chalcedon, that he might allow him an annual pension out of the revenues of the Church, which the council of Chalcedon[1] readily complied with. And this, as Richerius[2] ingenuously owns, was the ancient design and meaning of canonical pensions, which were not used to be granted but by the authority or approbation of a synod, and only to such, as having spent the greatest part of their life in the service of the Church, desired to be disburthened of their office by reason of their age. For the reserving a pension out of a bishopric, which a man only resigns to take another, was a practice wholly unknown to former ages.

SECT. 4.—No Clergyman to remove from one Diocese to another without the Consent and Letters Dimissory of his own Bishop.

Another rule, designed to keep all clergymen strictly to their duty, was,—that no one should remove from his own Church or diocese, without the consent of the bishop, to whose diocese he belonged. For as no one at first could be ordained ἀπολελυμένως, but must be fixed to some Church at his first ordination; so neither, by the rules and discipline of the Church then prevailing, might he exchange his station at pleasure, but must have his own bishop's license, or letters dimissory, to qualify him to remove from one diocese to another. For this was the ancient right, which every bishop had in the clergy of his own Church, that he could not be deprived of them without his own consent; but as well the party that deserted him, as the bishop that received him, were liable to be censured upon such a transgression. "If any presbyter, deacon, or other clerk," says the Apostolical Canons,[3] "forsake his own diocese to go to another, and

[1] Con. Chalced. Act. 7. al Act. 10. Edit. Labbe. tom. iv. p. 681. [2] Richer. Hist. Concil. par. i. c. 8. n. 30. p. 218. Nihil antiquitus consuetum fieri nisi synodicè comprobatum; hincque jus Pensionum Canonicarum potest confirmari; que iis tantum tribui consueverant, qui magnam vitæ partem in ministerio consumserant, et propter ætatem se exonerabant episcopatu.
[3] Canon. Apost. c. 15 et 16. Vid. Con. Chalced. can. 20.

there continue without the consent of his own bishop; we decree, that such an one shall no longer minister as a clerk, especially if after admonition he refuse to return, but only be admitted to communicate as a layman. And if the bishop, to whom they repair, still entertain them in the quality of clergymen, he shall be excommunicated as a master of disorder." The same rule is frequently repeated in the ancient councils, as that of Antioch,[1] the first and second of Arles,[2] the first and fourth of Carthage,[3] the first of Toledo,[4] and the council of Tours,[5] and Turin,[6] and the great council of Nice,[7] to whose canons it may be sufficient to refer the reader. I only observe, that this was the ancient use of letters dimissory, or as they were then called, Ἀπολυτικαὶ, Εἰρηνικαὶ, Συστατικαὶ, and *Concessoriæ*, which were *letters of license* granted by a bishop, for a clergyman to remove from his diocese to another; though we now take letters dimissory in another sense; but the old canons call those dimissory letters, which were given upon the occasion that I have mentioned. The council of Carthage gives them only the name of the bishop's letters,[8] but the council of Trullo styles them expressly,[9] dimissory; when, reinforcing all the ancient canons, it says, "No clergyman of what degree soever shall be entertained in another Church, ἐκτὸς της τῆ οἰκείᾳ Ἐπισκόπῃ ἐγγράφῃ ἀπολυτικῆς,—*without the dimissory letters of his own bishop;* which he might grant or refuse, as he saw proper occasion for it. For there was no law to compel him to grant it, whatever arts any clerk might use to gain a dismission any other way. St. Austin mentions a pretty strange case of this nature, that happened in his own diocese. One Timotheus, a subdeacon of his Church, being desirous to leave his post under St. Austin, and go to Severus, a neighbouring bishop, protests upon oath to Severus, that he would be no longer of St. Austin's Church; upon this Severus, pretending a reverence

[1] Con. Antioch. c. 3. [2] Arelat. i. c. 22. Arelat. ii. c. 13. [3] Con. Carth. i. c. 5. Carth. iv. c. 27. [4] Con. Tolet. i. c. 12. [5] Con. Turon. c. 11. [6] Con. Taurin. c. 6. [7] Con. Nic. c. 16. [8] Con. Carth. i. c. 5. Non licere Clericum alienum ab aliquo suscipi sine literis Episcopi sui, neque apud se retinere. [9] Con. Trull. c. 17.

for his oath, writes to St. Austin, and tells him, he could not return him his clerk for fear of making him guilty of perjury. To which St. Austin replied,[1] "that this opened a way to licentiousness, and there was an end of all ecclesiastical order and discipline, if a bishop would pretend to keep another man's clerk upon such a scruple, for fear of being accessory to his perjury." This evidently implies, that there was no law then to compel a bishop to grant letters dimissory to his clerk; for if there had been any such, Timotheus needed not to have used the stratagem of an oath, but might have compelled St. Austin to have granted them. But the Church then did not think fit to put it in every man's power to remove from one diocese to another, at his own pleasure, but left every bishop sole judge in this case, as best knowing the necessities and circumstances of his own Church, and whether it were expedient to part with the clergy, which were ordained for her service.

SECT. 5.—Laws against the Βακάντιβοι, or Wandering Clergy.

The laws were no less severe against all wandering clergymen, whom some of the ancients call Βακάντιβοι,[2] or *Vacantivi*, by way of reproach. They were a sort of idle persons, who having deserted the service of their own Church would fix in no other, but went roving from place to place, as their fancy and their humour led them. Now, by the laws of the Church, no bishop was to permit any such to officiate in his diocese, nor indeed so much as to communicate in his Church; because, having neither letters dimissory, nor letters commendatory from their own bishop, which every one ought to have that travelled, they were to be suspected either as deserters, or as persons guilty of some misdemeanor, who fled from ecclesiastical censure. Therefore the laws forbad the admitting of such, either to ecclesiastical or lay-communion. "A presbyter, or dea-

[1] Aug. Ep. 240. ad Severum. Aditus aperitur ad dissolvendum ordinem ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ, si alterius Ecclesiæ Clericus cuicunque juraverit, quod ab ipso non sit recessurus, eum secum esse permittat; ideo se facere affirmans, e author sit ejus perjurii, &c. [2] Synes. Ep. 67.

con," says the council of Agde,[1] "that rambles about without the letters of his bishop, shall not be admitted to communion by any other." The council of Epone[2] repeats the decree in the same words. And the council of Valentia,[3] in Spain, orders such wandering and roving clerks, as will not settle to the constant performance and attendance of divine offices in the Church, whereto they were deputed by the bishop that ordained them, to be deprived both of the communion and the honour of their order, if they persisted in their obstinacy and rebellion. So strict were the laws of the ancient Church in tying the inferior clergy to the service of that Church, to which they were first appointed, that they might not upon any account move thence, but at the discretion of the bishop that ordained them.

SECT. 6.—Laws against the Translations of Bishops from one See to another, how to be limited and understood.

Nor were the bishops so arbitrary in this matter, but that they themselves were under a like regulation, and liable to laws of the same nature. For, as no clerk could remove from his own Church without the license of his bishop, so neither might any bishop pretend to translate or move himself to another see, without the consent and approbation of a provincial council. Some few there were, who thought it absolutely unlawful for a bishop to forsake his first see, and betake himself to any other; because they looked upon his consecration to be a sort of marriage to his Church, from which he could not divorce himself, nor take another without incurring the crime of spiritual adultery. To this purpose they wrested that passage of St. Paul, "A bishop must be the husband of one wife," taking it in a mystical and figurative sense, as St. Jerom informs us.[4] But this was but the private opinion of one or two authors, which

[1] Con. Agathen. c. 52. Presbytero, sive Diacono sine Antistitis sui epistolis ambulanti communionem nullus impendat. [2] Con. Epaunens. c. 6. [3] Con. Valentin. c. 5. Vagus atque instabilis Clericus, si Episcopi, à quo ordinatus est, præceptis non obedierit, ut in delegatâ sibi Ecclesiâ officium dependat assiduum, quousque in vitio permanserit, et communione et honore privetur. [4] Hieron. Ep. 83. ad Oceanum. tom. ii. p. 321. Quidam coactè interpretantur uxores pro Ecclesiis, viros pro Episcopis debere accipi, &c.

never prevailed in the Catholic Church; whose prohibition of the translation of bishops was not founded upon any such reasons, but was only intended as a cautionary provision to prevent the ambition of aspiring men; that they might not run from lesser bishoprics to greater, without the authority of a provincial synod, which was the proper judge in such cases. Some canons indeed seem to forbid it absolutely and universally, as a thing not to be allowed in any case. The council of Nice,[1] and Sardica,[2] and some others prohibit it without any exception or limitation. But other canons restrain it to the case of a bishop's intruding himself into another see by some sinister arts, without any legal authority from a provincial synod. So those called the Apostolical Canons distinguish upon the matter:[3] "It shall not be lawful for a bishop to leave his diocese, and invade another, though many of the people would compel him to it, unless there be a reasonable cause, as that he may the more advantage the Church by his preaching; and then he shall not do it of his own head, but by the judgment and entreaty of many bishops, that is, a provincial synod." The fourth council of Carthage distinguishes much after the same manner:[4] "A bishop shall not remove himself from an obscure to a more honourable place out of ambition; but, if the advantage of the Church require it, he may be translated by the order and decree of a provincial synod." Schelstrate[5] and some other learned persons think, that these canons were a correction of the former; the one allowing what the other had positively forbidden. But this is not at all probable: it is more reasonable to think, that though in the Nicene and Sardican canons these exceptions are not expressed, yet they are to be understood; because the council of Nice itself translated Eustathius, bishop of Beræa, to Antioch, as Mr. Pagi[6] rightly observes

---

[1] Con. Nic. c. 15. [2] Con. Sardic. c. 1 et 2. Con. Antioch, can. 21. Con. Carth. iii. c. 38. [3] Canon. Apost. c. 14. [4] Con. Carth. iv. c. 27. Ut Episcopus de loco ignobili ad nobilem per ambitionem non transeat.—Sanè si id utilitas Ecclesiæ fiendum poposcerit, decreto pro eo Clericorum et Laicorum Episcopis porrecto, per sententiam synodi transferatur. [5] Schelstrat. de Concil. Antioch, can. 21. p. 614. [6] Pagi Critic. in Baron. An. 324, n. 22.

out of Sozomen,[1] and other historians of the Church. Which had been to break and affront their own rule at the very first, had it meant, that it should not be lawful in any case to translate a bishop from one see to another. We must conclude then, that the design of all these canons was the same, to prevent covetousness, ambition, and love of pre-eminence in aspiring men, who thrust themselves into other sees by irregular means, by a faction, or the mere favour of the people, without staying for the choice or consent of a synod; which was the common practice of the Arian party in the time of Constantine and Constantius, and occasioned so many laws to be made against it. But when a synod of bishops in their judgment and discretion thought it necessary to translate a bishop from a lesser to a greater see, for the benefit and advantage of the Church, there was no law to prohibit this, but there are a thousand instances of such promotions to be met with in ancient history; as Socrates[2] has observed long ago, who has collected a great many instances tothis purpose. Those, that please, may see more in Cotelerius[3] and bishop Beverege;[4] for in so plain a case I do not think it necessary to be more particular in my account of them, but proceed with other laws of the Church, which concerned the clergy.

Sect. 7.—Laws concerning the Residence of the Clergy.

The next laws of this nature were such as concerned the residence of the clergy; the design of which was the same as all the former, to bind them to constant attendance upon their duty. And these laws equally concerned bishops and all the inferior clergy. The council of Sardica has several canons relating to this matter. The seventh decrees, "that no bishop should go εἰς τραπόπεδον—*to the emperor's court*, unless the emperor by letter called him thither." The next canon provides,[5] "that whereas there might be several cases, which might require a bishop to make some application to the emperor in behalf of the poor, or widows, or such as

---

[1] Sozom. lib. i. c. 2.
[2] Socrat. lib. vii. c. 36.
[3] Coteler. Not. in Can. Apost. c. 14.
[4] Bevereg. Not. in Eund. Canon.
[5] Con. Sardic. c. 8.

fled for sanctuary to the Church, and condemned criminals, and the like; in such cases the deacons or subdeacons of the Church were to be employed to go in his name, that the bishop might fall under no censure at court, as neglecting the business of his Church." Justinian[1] has a law of the same import with these canons, "that no bishop should appear at court upon any business of his Church without the command of the prince; but if any petition was to be preferred to the emperor, relating to any civil contest, the bishop should depute his *Apocrisarius*, or *resident at court*, to act for him, or send his *Œconomus*, or some other of his clergy to solicit the cause in his name; that the Church might neither receive damage by his absence, nor be put to unnecessary expenses. Another canon[2] of the council of Sardica limits the absence of a bishop from his Church to three weeks, unless it were upon some very weighty and urgent occasion. And another canon[3] allows the same time for a bishop, who is possessed of an estate in another diocese, to go and collect his revenues, provided he celebrate divine service every Lord's day in the country Church, where his estate lies. And by two other canons[4] of that council, presbyters and deacons are limited to the same term of absence, and tied to the forementioned rules in the same manner as bishops were. The council of Agde[5] made the like order for the French Churches, decreeing, "that a presbyter or deacon, who was absent from his Church for three weeks, should be three years suspended from the communion. In the African Churches, upon the account of this residence, every bishop's house was to be near the Church by a rule of the fourth council of Carthage.[6] And in the fifth council there is another rule,[7] "that every bishop shall have his residence at his principal or cathedral

---

[1] Just. Novel. 6. c. 2. [2] Con. Sardic. c. 11. [3] Con. Sardic. c. 12. [4] Con. Sardic. c. 16 et 17. [5] Con. Agathen. c. 64. Diaconus vel Presbyter, si per tres hebdomadas ab Ecclesiâ suâ defuerit triennio à communione suspendatur. [6] Con. Carth. iv. c. 14. Ut Episcopus non longe ab Ecclesiâ hospitiolum habeat. [7] Con. Carth. v. c. 5. Placuit ut nemini sit facultas, relictâ principali cathedrâ, ad aliquam Ecclesiam in diocesi constitutam se conferre: vel in re propriâ diutius quàm oportet constitutum, curam vel frequentationem propriæ cathedræ negligere.

Church, which he shall not leave, to betake himself to any other Church in his diocese; nor continue upon his private concerns, to the neglect of his cure, and hindrance of his frequenting the cathedral Church." From this it appears, that the city Church was to be the chief place of the bishop's residence and cure: and Cabassutius,[1] in his remarks upon this canon, reflects upon the French bishops, as transgressing the ancient rule, in spending the greatest part of the year upon their pleasure in the country. Yet there is one thing, that seems a difficulty in this matter; for Justinian says,[2] "No bishop shall be absent from his Church above a whole year, unless he has the emperor's command for it." Which implies, that a bishop might be absent from his bishopric a year in ordinary cases, and more in extraordinary. But, I conceive, the meaning of this is, that he might be absent a year during his whole life; not year after year; for that would amount to a perpetual absence, which it was not the intent of the law to grant, but to tie them up to the direct contrary, except the prince upon some extraordinary affair thought fit to grant them a particular dispensation.

SECT. 8.—Of Pluralities, and the Laws made about them.

Another rule, grounded upon the same reasons with the former, was the inhibition of pluralities; which concerned both bishops, and the inferior clergy. As to bishops, it appears plainly from St. Ambrose, that it was not thought lawful for a bishop to have two Churches. For speaking of those words of the Apostle, "a bishop must be the husband of one wife," he says,[3] "If we look only to the superficies of the letter, it forbids a digamist to be ordained bishop; but if we penetrate a little deeper to the profounder sense, it prohibits a bishop to have two Churches."

---

[1] Cabassut. Notit. Con, c. 44. Huic canoni contravenlunt Episcopi, qui magnâ parte anni rure versantur et deliciantur. [2] Justin. Novel. 6. c. 2. Et illud etiam definimus, ut nemo Deo amabilium Episcoporum foris à suâ Ecclesiâ plusquam per totum annum abesse audeat, nisi hoc per imperialem fiat jussionem. [3] Ambros. de Dignit. Sacerd. c. 4. Si ad superficiem tantûm literæ respiciamus, prohibet bigamum Episcopum ordinari: si verò ad altiorem sensum conscendimus, inhibet Episcopum duas usurpare Ecclesias.

That is, wherever there were two dioceses before, it was not lawful for one bishop to usurp them both, except where the wisdom of the Church and State thought it most convenient to join them into one. And it is remarkable, that though there be many instances of bishops removing from lesser sees to greater; yet there is no example in all ancient history, that I remember, of any such bishops holding both together; no, not among the Arians themselves, who were the least concerned in observing rules of any other. As to the case of the inferior clergy, we must distinguish betwixt diocesan and parochial Churches, and between the office and the benefit in parochial Churches. The circumstances and necessities of the Church might sometimes require a presbyter or deacon to officiate in more than one parochial Church, when there was a scarcity of ministers; but the revenues of such Churches did not thereupon belong to him, because they were paid into the common stock of the city or cathedral Church, from whence he had his monthly or yearly portion in the division of the whole, as has been noted before. And this makes it further evident, that in those early ages there could be no such thing as plurality of benefices, but only a plurality of offices in the same diocese, within such a district, as that a man might personally attend and officiate in two parocial Churches. But then as to different dioceses, it being ordinarily impossible, that a man should attend a cure in two dioceses, the canons are very express in prohibiting any one from having a name in two Churches, or partaking of the revenues of both. The council of Chalcedon has a peremptory canon to this purpose:[1] "It shall not be lawful for any clergyman to have his name in the church-roll or catalogue of two cities at the same time, that is, in the Church, where he was first ordained, and any other, to which he flies out of ambition as to a greater Church; but all such shall be returned to their own Church, where they were first ordained, and only minister there. But if any one is regularly removed from one Church to another, he shall not partake of the revenues

[1] Con. Chalced. c. 10. Μὴ ἐξεῖναι κληρικὸν ἐν δύο πόλεων κατ' αὐτὸν καταλέγεσθαι ἐκκλησίαις, &c.

of the former Church, or of any oratory, hospital, or almshouse belonging to it. And such, as shall presume, after this definition of this great and œcuminical council, to transgress in this matter, are condemned to be degraded by the holy synod." And, that none might pretend under any other notion to evade this law, the same rule was made for monasteries, that one abbot should not preside over two monasteries at the same time. Which provision is made by the council of Agde[1] and Epone, and confirmed by the imperial laws of Justinian,[2] who inserted it into his Code. Now the design of all these laws was to oblige the clergy to constant attendance upon their duty in the Church, where they were first ordained; from which if they once removed, whether with license or without, to any other diocese, they were no longer to enjoy any dividend in the Church or diocese, to which they first belonged. And this rule continued for several ages after the council of Chalcedon, being renewed in the second council of Nice,[3] and other later councils.

Sect. 9.—Laws prohibiting the Clergy to take upon them Secular Business and Offices.

In pursuance of the same design, to keep the clergy strict and constant to their duty, laws were also made to prohibit them from following any secular employment, which might divert them too much from their proper business and calling. Among those called the Apostolical Canons, there are three to this purpose. One of which says,[4] "no bishop, presbyter, or deacon, shall take upon him any worldly cares, under pain of degradation." Another says,[5] "no bishop or presbyter shall concern himself in any secular offices or administrations, that he may have more time to attend the needs and business of the Church; and this under the same penalty of degradation." The last

---

[1] Con. Agathen. c. 57. Unum Abbatem duobus monasteriis interdicimus præsidere. Vid. Con. Epaunens. c. 9. [2] Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 40. Non sit verò Abbas duorum monasteriorum. [3] Con. Nic. 2. c. 15. [4] Can. Apost. c. 7. Κοσμικὰς φροντίδας μὴ ἀναλαμβανέτω. εἰδὲ μὴ, καθαιρέσθω. [5] Ibid. c. 81. Ὅτι μὴ χρὴ ἐπίσκοπον ἢ πρεσβύτερον καθιέναι ἑαυτὸν εἰς δημοσίας διοικήσεις, &c.

says,[1] "a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, that busies himself in any secular office, and is minded to hold both a place in the Roman Government, and an office in the Church, shall be deposed. For the things of Cæsar belong to Cæsar, and the things of God to God." Balsamon and Zonaras take this canon to mean only the prohibition of holding military offices, because it uses the word στρατεία: but I have showed before, out of Gothofred and others, that the words, στρατεία and *militia*, are used by the Romans in a larger signification, to denote all kinds of secular offices, as well civil as military; and therefore they more rightly interpret this canon,[2] who understand it as a prohibition of holding any secular office, civil as well as military, with an ecclesiastical one, as things incompatible and inconsistent with one another. Eusebius informs us, from the Epistle of the council of Antioch,[3] which deposed Paulus Samosatensis, "that, among other crimes alleged against him, this was one,—that he took upon him secular places, and preferred the title of *Ducenarius* before that of bishop." The *Ducenarii* among the Romans were a sort of civil officers, so called from their receiving a salary of *two hundred Sestertia* from the emperor, as Valesius[4] observes out of Dio. And this makes it plain, that the intent of the canons was to prohibit the clergy from meddling with civil offices, as well as military. Only in some extraordinary cases, where the matter was a business of great necessity or charity, we meet with an instance or two of a bishop's joining an ecclesiastical and civil office together, without any censure. As Theodoret[5] notes of the famous Jacobus Nisibensis, that he was both bishop and prince, or governor of Nisibis, or Antioch in Mygdonia, a city in the confines of the Persian and Roman empires. Theodoret represents him as a man of great fame in his country for his miracles, by which he sometimes relieved the city, when besieged by the Persians;

---

[1] Can. Apost. c. 83. Στρατείᾳ σχολάζων, ἢ βουλόμενος ἀμφότερα κατέχειν, Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἀρχὴν ἢ ἱερατικὴν διοίκησιν, καθαιρέσθω. [2] Bevereg. Not. in Can. Apost. c. 83. [3] Euseb. lib. vii. c. 30. Κοσμικὰ ἀξιώματα ὑποδυόμενος, ἢ δουκηνάριος μᾶλλον ἢ ἐπίσκοπος, θέλων καλεῖσθαι.

[4] Valesius in Loc. Ducenarii dicebantur procuratores, qui ducenta sestertia annui salarii nomine accipiebant à Principe ex Dione, lib. liii. [5] Theod. lib. ii. c. 30.

and it is probable, in regard to this, the emperors, Constantine and Constantius, pitched upon him, as the properest person to take the government of the city upon him, being a place in great danger, and very much exposed to the incursions of the Persians. But such instances are rarely met with in ancient history.

SECT. 10.—Laws prohibiting the Clergy to be Tutors and Guardians, how far extended.

In some times and places the laws of the Church were so strict about this matter, that they would not suffer a bishop or presbyter to be left trustee to any man's will, or a tutor or guardian in pursuance of it; because it was thought this would be too great an avocation from his other business. There is a famous case in Cyprian relating to this matter. He tells us, it had been determined by an African synod, that no one should appoint any of God's ministers a curator or guardian by his will, because they were to give themselves to supplications and prayer, and to attend only upon the sacrifice and service of the altar. And therefore,[1] when one Geminius Victor had made Geminius Faustinus, a presbyter of the Church of Furni, guardian or trustee by his last will and testament, contrary to the decree of the foresaid council, Cyprian wrote to the Church of Furni, that they should execute the sentence of the council against Victor, which was, that no annual commemoration should be made of him in the Church, nor any prayer be offered in his name, according to the custom of the Church in those times, in the sacrifice of the altar. This was a sort of excommunication after death, by denying to receive such a person's oblations, and refusing to name him at the altar among others that made their offerings, and neither honouring him with the common prayers or praises, that were then put up to God for all the faithful that were dead in the Lord. This was the punishment of such as transgressed this rule in the

[1] Cypr. Ep. 66. al. 1. ad Cler. Furnitan. p. 3. Ideò Victor cùm contra formam nuper in Concilio à sacerdotibus datam, Geminium Faustinum, Presbyterum, ausus sit tutorem constituere, non est quod pro dormitione ejus apud vos fiat oblatio, aut deprecatio aliqua nomine ejus in Ecclesiâ frequentetur.

days of Cyprian. And in the following ages the canon was renewed, but with a little difference. For though bishops were absolutely and universally forbidden to take this office upon them, both by the ecclesiastical and civil law;[1] yet presbyters, and deacons, and all the inferior clergy, were allowed to be tutors and guardians to such persons, as by right of kindred might claim this as a duty from them. But still the prohibition stood in force against their being concerned in that office for any other, that were not of their relations, as appears from one of Justinian's Novels,[2] which was made to settle this matter in the Church.

SECT. 11.—Laws against their being Sureties, and pleading Causes at the Bar, in behalf of themselves, or their Churches.

By other laws they were prohibited from taking upon them the office of pleaders at the bar in any civil contest, though it were in their own case, or the concerns of the Church. Neither might they be bondsmen or sureties for any other man's appearance in such causes; because it was thought, that such sort of incumbrances might bring detriment to the Church, in distracting her ministers from constant attendance upon divine service, as appears both from the foresaid Novel of Justinian,[3] and some ancient canons,[4] which forbid a clergyman to become a sponsor in any such cause under the penalty of deprivation.

SECT. 12.—Laws against their following Secular Trades and Merchandize.

Now as all these offices and employments were forbidden the clergy upon the account of being consumers of their time, and hindrances of divine service; so there were some others

---

[1] Con. Carth. iv. c. 18. Ut Episcopus tuitionem testamentorum non suscipiat. [2] Just. Novel. 123. c. 5. Episcopos et Monachos ex nullâ lege tutores aut curatores cujuscunque personæ fieri concedimus. Presbyteros autem et Diaconos et Subdiaconos, si jure ac lege cognationis ad tutelam aut curam vocentur, ejusmodi munus suscipere concedimus. Vid. Con. Chalced. c. 3. [3] Just. Novel. 123. c. 6. Sed neque procuratorem litis, aut fide jussorem pro talibus causis Episcopum, aut alium Clericum, proprio nomine, aut Ecclesiæ sinimus; ne per hanc occasionem sacra ministeria impediantur. [4] Canon. Apost. c. 20. Κληρικὸς ἐγγύας διδοὺς καθαιρείσθω. Vid. Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 6.

prohibited, not only upon this account, but also upon the notion of their being generally attended with covetousness and filthy lucre. Thus, in the first council of Carthage,[1] we find several prohibitions of clergymen's becoming stewards or accountants to laymen. The third council[2] forbids both that, and also their taking any houses or lands to farm, and generally all business, that was disreputable and unbecoming their calling. The second council of Arles[3] likewise forbids their farming other men's estates, or following any trade or merchandize for filthy lucre's sake, under the penalty of deprivation. The general-council of Chalcedon has a canon to the same purpose,[4] "that no monk or clergyman shall rent any estate, or take upon him the management of any secular business, except the law called him to be guardian to orphans, in the case that has been spoken of before, as being their next relation, or else the bishop made him steward of the Church-revenues, or overseer of the widows, orphans, and such others, as stood in need of the Church's care and assistance." And here the reason given for making this canon is, that some of the clergy were found to neglect the service of God, and live in laymen's houses, as their stewards, for covetousness and filthy lucre's sake. Which was an old complaint made by Cyprian,[5] in that sharp invective of his against some of the bishops of his own age, who were so far gone in this vice of covetousness, as to neglect the service of God to follow worldly business; leaving their sees, and deserting their people, to ramble about in quest of gainful trades in other countries, to the provocation of the divine vengeance, and flagrant scandal of the Church. So that, these being

---

[1] Con. Carth. i. c. 6. Qui serviunt Deo, et annexi sunt clero, non accedant ad actus seu administrationem vel procurationem domorum. Ibid. c. 9. Laicis non liceat Clericos nostros eligere apothecarios vel ratiocinatores.

[2] Con. Carth. iii. c. 15. Clerici non sint conductores, neque procuratores, neque ullo turpi vel inhonesto negotio victum quærant. [3] Con. Arelat. i. al. 2. c. 14. Siquis Clericus conductor alienæ rei voluerit esse aut turpis lucri gratiâ aliquod genus negotiationis exercuerit, depositus à clero, à communione alienus habeatur. [4] Con. Chalced. c. 3.

[5] Cypr. de Lapsis, p. 123. Episcopi plurimi divinâ procuratione contemptâ, procuratores rerum secularium fieri, derelictâ cathedrâ, plebe desertâ, per alienas provincias oberrantes, negotiationis quæstuosæ nundinas aucupari, &c.

the reasons of making such laws, we are to judge of the nature of the laws themselves by the intent and design of them; which was to correct such manifest abuses, as covetousness and neglect of divine service, which, either as cause or effect, too often attended the clergy's engagement of themselves in secular business.

SECT. 13.—What Limitations and Exceptions these Laws admitted of.

But in some cases it was reasonable to presume, that their engagements of this nature were separate from these vices. For in some times and places, where the revenues of the Church were very small, and not a competent maintenance for all the clergy, some of them, especially among the inferior orders, were obliged to divide themselves between the service of the Church and some secular calling. Others, who found they had time enough to spare, negotiated out of charity, to bestow their gains in the relief of the poor, and other pious uses. And some, who, before their entrance into orders, had been brought up to an ascetic and philosophic life, wherein they wrought at some honest manual calling with their own hands, continued to work in the same manner, though not in the same measure, even after they were made presbyters and bishops in the Church; for the exercise of their humility, or to answer some other end of a Christian life. Now in all these cases, the vices complained of in the forementioned laws, as the reasons of the prohibition, had no share or concern; for such men's negociations were neither the effects of covetousness, nor attended properly with any neglect of divine service; and consequently not within the prohibition and censure of the laws.

For first, both the laws of Church and State allowed the inferior clergy to work at an honest calling, in cases of necessity, to provide themselves of a liberal maintenance, when the revenues of the Church could not do it. In the fourth council of Carthage[1] there are three canons, immediately following one another, to this purpose; "that they should

[1] Con. Carth. iv. c. 51. Clericus quantumlibet verbo Dei eruditus, artificio victum quærat. Ibid. c. 52. Clericus victum et vestimentum sibi, artificiolo vel agriculturâ, absque officii sui duntaxât detrimento, præparet. Ibid. c. 53. Omnes Clerici, qui ad operandum validi sunt, et artificiola et literas discant.

provide themselves of food and raiment at some honest trade or husbandry, without hindering the duties of their office in the Church; and such of them, as were able to labour, should be taught some trade and letters together." And the laws of the State were so far from hindering this, that they encouraged such of the clergy to follow an honest calling, by granting them a special immunity from the *Chrysargyrum*, or *lustral tax*, which was exacted of all other tradesmen, as I have showed more at large in another place.[1]

Secondly. It was lawful also to spend their leisure hours upon any manual trade or calling, when it was to answer some good end of charity thereby; as that they might not be overburdensome to the Church, or might have some superfluities to bestow upon the indigent and needy; or even that they might set the laity a provoking example of industry and diligence in their callings: which were those worthy ends, which the holy Apostle St. Paul proposed to himself in labouring with his own hands at the trade of tent-making; after whose example many eminent bishops of the ancient Church were not ashamed to employ their spare hours in some honest labour, to promote the same ends of charity, which the Apostle so frequently inculcates. Thus Sozomen[2] observes of Zeno, bishop of Maiuma, in Palæstine, "that he lived to be an hundred years old, all which time he constantly attended both morning and evening the service of the Church, and yet found time to work at the trade of a linen-weaver, by which he not only subsisted himself, but relieved others, though he lived in a rich and wealthy Church." Epiphanius[3] makes a more general observation against the Massalian heretics, who were great encouragers of idleness,—"that not only all those of a monastic life, but also many of the priests of God, imitating their holy father in Christ, St. Paul, wrought with their own hands at some honest trade, that was no dishonour to their dignity, and consistent with their constant attendance upon their ecclesiastical duties; by which means they had both what was

[1] Book v. chap. iii. sect. 6. [2] Sozom. lib. vii. c. 28. [3] Epiphan. Hær. 80. Massalian. n. 6.

necessary for their own subsistence, and to give to others, that stood in need of their relief." The author of the Apostolical Constitutions[1] brings in the Apostles recommending industry in every man's calling, from their own example, that they might have wherewith to sustain themselves, and supply the needs of others. Which though it be not an exact representation of the Apostle's practice, for we do not read of any other Apostle's labouring with his own hands, except St. Paul, whilst he preached the Gospel, yet it serves to show what sense that author had of this matter; that he did not think it simply unlawful for a clergyman to labour at some secular employment, when the end was charity, and not filthy lucre. And it is observable, that the imperial laws for some time granted the same immunity from the lustral tax to the inferior clergy, that traded with a charitable design to relieve others, as to those that traded out of necessity for their own maintenance; of both which I have given an account in another place.

Thirdly. We have some instances of very eminent bishops, who, out of humility and love of a philosophical and laborious life, spent their vacant hours in some honest business, to which they had been accustomed in their former days. Thus Ruffin,[2] and Socrates,[3] and Sozomen,[4] tell us of Spiridion, bishop of Trimithus in Cyprus, one of the most eminent bishops in the council of Nice, a man famous for the gift of prophecy and miracles, "that, having been a shepherd before, he continued to employ himself in that calling, out of his great humility, all his life." But then he made his actions and the whole tenor of his life demonstrate, that he did it not out of covetousness. For Sozomen particularly notes, "that, whatever his product was, he either distributed it among the poor, or lent it without usury to such as needed to borrow, whom he trusted to take out of his storehouse what they pleased, and return what they pleased, without ever examining or taking any account of them."

---

[1] Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 63. [2] Ruffin. lib. i. c. 5. Hic pastor ovium etiam in episcopatu positus permansit. [3] Socrat. lib. i. c. 12. Διὰ δὲ ἀτυφίαν πολλὴν, ἰχόμενος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐπόιμαινε ἐν τὰ πρόβατα. [4] Sozom. lib. i. c. 11.

Fourthly. I observe, that those laws, which were most severe against the superior clergy's negociating in any secular business, in cases of necessity allowed them a privilege, which was equivalent to it; that is, that they might employ others to factor for them, so long as they were not concerned in their own persons. For so the council of Eliberis words it:[1] "Bishops, presbyters, and deacons, shall not leave their station to follow a secular calling, nor rove into other provinces after fairs and markets. But yet, to provide themselves a livelihood, they may employ a son, or a freeman, or an hired servant, or a friend, or any other: and, if they negociate, let them negociate within their own province." So that all these laws were justly tempered with great wisdom and prudence; that as, on the one hand, the service of God and the needs of his ministers and servants might be supplied together; so, on the other, no encouragement should be given to covetousness in the clergy, nor any one be countenanced in the neglect of his proper business, by a license to lead a wandering, busy, distracted life, which did not become those, that were dedicated to the sacred function. It is against these only, that all the severe invectives of St. Jerom,[2] and others of the ancients,[3] are levelled, which the reader must interpret with the same limitations and distinction of cases, as we have done the public laws; the design of both being only to censure the vices of the rich, who, without any just reason or necessity, immersed themselves in the cares of a secular life, contrary to the rules and tenor of their profession.

Sect. 14.—Laws respecting their outward Conversation.

Another sort of laws were made respecting their outward behaviour, to guard them equally against scandal in their

---

[1] Con. Eliber. c. 19. Episcopi, Presbyteri, et Diaconi, de locis suis negotiandi causâ non discedant, nec circumeuntes provincias, quæstuosas nundinas sectentur. Sanè ad victum sibi conquirendum, aut filium, aut libertum, aut mercenarium, aut amicum, aut quemlibet mittant: et si voluerint negotiari, intra provinciam negotientur. [2] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepotian. Negotiatorem Clericum quasi pestem fuge, &c. [3] Sulpic. Sever. Hist. lib. i. p. 30. Tanta hoc tempore animos eorum habendi cupido veluti tabes incessit: inhiant possessionibus, prædia excolunt, auro incubant, emunt, venduntque quæstui, per omnia student, &c.

character, and danger in their conversation. Such were the laws against corresponding and conversing too familiarly with Jews, and Gentile philosophers. The council of Eliberis[1] forbids them to eat with the Jews under pain of suspension. The council of Agde[2] has a canon to the same purpose, forbidding them to give, as well as receive an entertainment from the Jews. And those called the Apostolical Canons[3] not only prohibit them to fast or feast with the Jews, but to receive "τῆς ἑορτῆς ξένια,"—any of those portions or presents, which they were used to send to one another upon their festivals. And the laws against conversing with Gentile philosophers were much of the same nature. For Sozomen says,[4] Theodotus, bishop of Laodicea, in Syria, excommunicated the two Apollinarii, father and son, because they went to hear Epiphanius, the sophist, speak his hymn in the praise of Bacchus; which was not so agreeable to their character, the one being a presbyter, the other a deacon in the Christian Church. It was in regard to their character likewise, that other canons restrained them from eating or drinking in a tavern, except they were upon a journey, or some such necessary occasion required them to do it. For among those called the Apostolical Canons,[5] and the decrees of the councils of Laodicea[6] and Carthage,[7] there are several rules to this purpose; the strictness of which is not much to be wondered at, since Julian required the same caution in his heathen priests, that they should neither appear at the public theatres, nor in any taverns, under pain of deposition from their office of priesthood, as may be seen in his letter to Arsacius, high-priest of Galatia, which Sozomen records,[8] and other fragments of his writings.

Sect. 15.—Laws relating to their Habit.

To this sort of laws we may reduce those ancient rules,

---

[1] Con. Eliber. c. 50. Clericus, qui cum Judæis cibum sumpserit, placuit eum à communione abstinere, ut debeat emendari. [2] Con. Agathen. c. 40. Omnes Clerici Judæorum convivia evitent. Nec eos ad convivia quisquam excipiat. [3] Canon. Apost. c. 70. [4] Sozom. lib. vi. c. 25. [5] Canon. Apost. c. 53. [6] Con. Laodic. c. 24. [7] Con. Carth. iii. c. 27. [8] Sozom. lib. v. c. 16. Vid. Julian. Fragment. Epist. p. 547.

which concerned the garb and habit of the ancient clergy; in which such a decent mean was to be observed, as might keep them from obloquy and censure on both hands, either as too nice and critical, or too slovenly and careless in their dress: their habit being generally to be such, as might express the gravity of their minds without any superstitious singularities, and their modesty and humility without affectation. In this matter therefore their rules were formed according to the customs and opinions of the age, which are commonly the standard and measure of decency and indecency, in things of this nature. Thus for instance, long hair, and baldness by shaving the head or beard, being then generally reputed indecencies in contrary extremes, the clergy were obliged to observe a becoming mediocrity between them. This is the meaning of that controverted canon of the fourth council of Carthage, according to its true reading,[1] "that a clergyman shall neither indulge long hair, nor shave his beard,—*Clericus nec comam nutriat, nec barbam radat.*" The contrary custom being now in vogue in the Church of Rome, Bellarmin[2] and many other writers of that side, who will have all their ceremonies to be apostolical, and to contain some great mystery in them, pretend, that the word, *radat*, should be left out of that ancient canon, to make it agreeable to the present practice. But the learned Savaro[3] proves the other to be the true reading, as well from the Vatican, as many other MSS. And even Spondanus himself[4] confesses as much, and thereupon takes occasion to correct Baronius for asserting, that, in the time of Sidonius Apollinaris, it was the custom of the French bishops to shave their beards: whereas the contrary appears from one of Sidonius's Epistles,[5] that their custom then was to wear short hair and long beards, as he describes his friend Maximus Palatinus, who of a secular was become a clergyman: he says, "His habit, his gait, his modesty, his countenance, his discourse, were

---

[1] Con. Carth. iv. c. 44. [2] Bellarm. de Monach. lib. ii. c. 40.
[3] Savaro. Not. in Sidonium. lib. iv. Ep. 24. p. 306. [4] Spondan. Epit. Baron. an. 58. n. 58. [5] Sidon. lib. iv. Ep. 24. Habitus viro, gradus, pudor, color, sermo religiosus: tum coma brevis, barba prolixa, &c.

all religious; and agreeably to these, his hair was short, and his beard long." Custom, it seems, had then made it decent and becoming; and upon that ground the ancients are sometimes pretty severe against such of the clergy as transgressed in this point, as guilty of an indecency in going contrary to the rules and customs of the Church, which were to be observed, though the thing was otherwise in itself of an indifferent nature.

SECT. 16.—The Tonsure of the Ancients very different from that of the Romish Church.

The Romanists are generally as much to blame in their accounts of the ancient tonsure of the clergy; which they describe in such a manner, as to make parallel to that shaving of the crown of the head by way of mystical rite, which is now the modern custom. Whereas this was so far from being required as a matter of decency among the ancients, that it was condemned and prohibited by them. Which may appear from that question, which Optatus puts to the Donatists,[1] when he asks them,—"where they had a command to shave the heads of the priests?" as they had done by the Catholic clergy in order to bring them to do public penance in the Church. In which case, as Albaspinæus rightly notes,[2] "it was customary to use shaving to baldness, and sprinkling the head with ashes, as signs of sorrow and repentance. But the priests of God were not to be thus treated." Which shows that the ancients then knew nothing of this, as a ceremony belonging to the ordination, or life of the clergy. Which is still more evident from what St. Jerom says upon those words of Ezekiel, xliv. 20. "Neither shall they shave their heads, nor suffer their locks to grow long, they shall only poll their heads."—"This," says he,[3] "evidently demonstrates, that we ought neither to have

[1] Optat. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. p. 58. Docete, ubi vobis mandatum est radere capita Sacerdotum, cum e contrario sint tot exempla proposita, fieri nos debere. - - - Qui parare debebas aures ad audiendum, parasti novaculam ad delinquendum. [2] Albasp. in Loc. p. 141. [3] Hieron. lib. xiii. in Ezek. cap. xliv. p. 668. Quod autem sequitur, capita sua non radent, &c. perspicuè demonstratur, nec rasis capitibus, sicut sacerdotes, cultoresque Isidis atque Serapis, nos esse debere; nec rursùm comam demittere, quod

our heads shaved, as the priests and votaries of Isis and Serapis; nor yet to suffer our hair to grow long, after the luxurious manner of barbarians, and soldiers, but that priests should appear with a venerable and grave countenance; neither are they to make themselves bald with a razor, nor poll their heads so close, that they may look as if they were shaven; but they are to let their hair grow so long, that it may cover their skin." It is impossible now for any rational man to imagine, that Christian priests had shaven crowns in the time of St. Jerom, when he so expressly says, they had not, and that none but the priests of Isis and Serapis had. But the custom was to poll their heads, and cut their hair to a moderate degree; not for any mystery that was in it, but for the sake of decency and gravity; that they might neither affect the manners of the luxurious part of the world, which prided itself in long hair; nor fall under contempt and obloquy by an indecent baldness; but express a sort of venerable modesty in their looks and aspects, which is the reason that St. Jerom assigns for the ancient tonsure.

SECT. 17.—Of the *Corona Clericalis*, and why the Clergy called *Coronati*.

From hence we may further conclude, that the ancient clergy were not called *Coronati* from their shaven crowns, as some would have it, since it is evident there was no such thing among them. But it seems rather a name given them, as Gothofred[1] and Savaro[2] conjecture, from the form of the ancient tonsure; which was made in a circular figure, by cutting away the hair a little from the crown of the head, and leaving a round or circle hanging downwards. This in some councils[3] is called *Circuli Corona*, and ordered to be used in opposition to some heretics, who it seems prided themselves in long hair and the contrary custom. But I am not confident, that this was the reason of the name,

propriè luxuriosum est, barbarorumque et militantium; sed ut honestus habitus Sacerdotum facie demonstretur; nec calvitium novaculâ esse faciendum, nec ita ad pressum tondendum caput, ut rasorum similes esse videamur; sed in tantum capillos esse demittendos, ut operta sit cutis. [1] Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 38. [2] Savaro Not. in Sidon. lib. vi. Ep. 3. [3] Con. Tolet. .iv c. 40. Omnes Clerici, detonso superius capite toto, inferius solam circuli coronam relinquant, &c.

Coronati. It might be given the clergy in general, out of respect to their office and character, which was always of great honour and esteem: for *Corona* signifies honour and dignity in a figurative sense, and it is not improbable but that the word was sometimes so used in this case, as has been noted before[1] in speaking of the form of saluting bishops, *Per Coronam*.

SECT. 18.—Whether the Clergy were distinguished in their Apparel from Laymen.

As to the kind or fashion of their apparel, it does not appear for several ages, that there was any other distinction observed therein between them and the laity, save that they were more confined to wear that which was modest and grave, and becoming their profession, without being tied to any certain garb or form of clothing. Several councils require the clergy to wear apparel suitable to their profession; but they do not express any kind, or describe it otherwise, than that it should not border upon luxury or any affected neatness, but rather keep a medium between finery and slovenliness. This was St. Jerom's direction to Nepotian,[2] "that he should neither wear black nor white clothing. For gaity and slovenliness were equally to be avoided; the one savouring of niceness and delicacy, and the other of vain-glory." Yet in different places different customs seem to have prevailed, as to the colour of their clothing. For at Constantinople, in the time of Chrysostom and Arsacius, the clergy commonly went in black, as the Novatians did in white. Which appears from the dispute, which Socrates[3] speaks of between Sisinnius, the Novatian bishop, and one of Arsacius's clergy: for he says, "Sisinnius going one day to visit Arsacius, the clergyman asked him, why he wore a garment which did not become a bishop? and where it was written, that a priest ought to be clothed in white? to whom he replied, you first show me, where it is written, that a bishop ought to be clothed in black?" From

[1] Book ii. chap. ix. sect. 5. [2] Hieron. Ep. 2. ad Nepot. Vestes pullas æquè devita, ut candidas. Ornatus, ut sordes pari modo fugiendæ sunt; quia alterum delicias, alterum gloriam redolet, &c. [3] Socrat, lib. vi. c. 22.

this it is easy to collect, that by this time it was become the custom at Constantinople for the clergy to wear black, and that perhaps to distinguish themselves from the Novatians, who affected it seems to appear in white. But we do not find these matters as yet so particularly determined or prescribed in any councils. For the fourth council of Carthage[1] requires the clergy to wear such apparel, as was suitable to their profession, but does not particularize any further about it, save that they should not affect any finery or gaity in their shoes or clothing. And the council of Agde[2] gives the very same direction. Baronius[3] indeed is very earnest to persuade his reader, that bishops in the time of Cyprian wore the same habit, that is now worn by cardinals in the Church of Rome, and such bishops, as are advanced from a monastery to the episcopal throne. As if Cyprian had been a monk or a cardinal of the Church of Rome. But, as the learned editor[4] of Cyprian's works observes, there is scarce any thing so absurd, that a man, who is engaged in a party-cause, cannot persuade himself to believe, and hope to persuade others also. For is it likely, that bishops and presbyters should make their appearance in public in a distinct habit, at a time, when tyrants and persecutors made a most diligent search after them to put them to death? do the clergy of the present Church of Rome use to appear so in countries, where they live in danger of being discovered and taken? but what shall we say to the writer of Cyprian's Passion, who mentions Cyprian's[5] *Lacerna* or *Birrus*, and after that his *Tunica* or *Dalmatica*, and last of all his *Linea*, in which he suffered? of which Baronius makes the *Linea* to be the bishop's rochet; and the *Dalmatica* or *Tunica*, that which they now call the loose tunicle; and the *Lacerna* or *Birrus*, the red

---

[1] Con. Carth. iv. c. 45. Clericus professionem suam et in habitu et in incessu probet: et ideò nec vestibus nec calceamentis decorem quærat. [2] Con. Agathen. c. 20. Vestimenta vel calceamenta etiam eis, nisi quæ religionem deceant, uti aut habere non liceat. [3] Baron. an. 261. n. 44.
[4] Vid. Bp. Fell. Not. in Vit. Cypr. p. 13. [5] Passio Cypr. p. 13. Cyprianus in agrum Sexti productus est, et ibi se Lacernâ Birri expoliavit. - - - Et cùm se Dalmaticâ (al. Tunicâ) expoliasset, et diaconibus tradidisset, in lineâ stetit, et cœpit spiculatorem sustinere.

silken vestment that covers the shoulders. Why, to all this it may be said, that these are only old names for new things. For besides the absurdity of thinking, that Cyprian should go to his martyrdom in his sacred and pontifical robes, which were not to be worn out of the Church, it is evident these were but the names of those common garments, which many Christians then used without distinction. F. Simon,[1] speaking of the canons of the synods of Poitiers and Langree, Anno 1396 and 1404, says, the clergy did not then wear clothes of a particular colour; they were only forbidden to wear red, green, or any other such colour. In former times there was no distinction of clothes between the clergy and the laity: all men of any note wore long clothes, as one may see in old pictures. None, but the common people, wore short ones; which occasioned the word, *courtant de boutique*. None were then called gown-men; but because short clothes appeared by degrees to be very convenient, they grew fashionable. However the magistrates and the clergy continued to wear long clothes: an ecclesiastic could not wear a short gown, reaching no lower than his knee, without acting against his character.

SECT. 19.—A particular Account of the *Birrus* and *Pallium*.

As to the *Birrus*, it is evident that it was no peculiar habit of bishops, no, nor yet of the clergy. That it was not peculiar to bishops, appears from what St. Austin[2] says of it, that it was the common garment, which all his clergy wore as well as himself. And therefore if any one presented him with a richer *Birrus* than ordinary, he would not wear it. "For, though it might become another bishop, it would not become him, who was a poor man, and born of poor parents. He must have such an one, as a presbyter could have, or a deacon, or a subdeacon. If any one gave him a

[1] Bibl. Critique. vol. iii. n. 31. cited by Mr. La Roche. Memoir. vol. ii. p. 3. [2] Aug. Serm. 50. de Diversis, tom. x. p. 523. Offeratur mihi birrum pretiosum, forte decet Episcopum, quamvis non deceat Augustinum, id est, hominem pauperem, de pauperibus natum. - - - Talem debeo habere, qualem potest habere Presbyter, qualem potest habere Diaconus, et Subdiaconus. - - - Si quis meliorem dederit, vendo, quod et facere soleo, ut quando non potest vestis esse communis, pretium vestis sit commune.

better, he was used to sell it; that, since the garment itself could not be used in common, the price of it at least might be common." This shows plainly, that the *Birrus* was not the bishop's peculiar habit, but the common garment of all St. Austin's clergy. And that this was no more than the common *Tunica*, or *coat*, worn generally by Christians in Afric and other places, may appear from a canon of the council of Gangra,[1] made against Eustathius, the heretic, and his followers, who condemned the common habit, and brought in the use of a strange habit in its room. Now this common habit was the *Birrus*, or Βῆρος, as they call it in the canon made against them, which runs in these words:[2] "If any man uses the *Pallium*, or *cloak*, upon the account of an ascetic life, and, as if there were some holiness in that, condemns those, that with reverence use the *Birrus*, and other garments, that are commonly worn, let him be anathema." The *Birrus* then was the common and ordinary coat, which the Christians of Paphlagonia and those parts generally wore; and though the ascetics used the Περιβόλαιον, the philosophic *Pallium*, or *cloak*, yet the clergy of that country used the common *Birrus*, or *coat*. For Sozomen,[3] in relating the same history, instead of Βῆρος, uses the word Χίτων, which is a more known name for the Latin *Tunica*, or *coat*; and he also adds, "that Eustathius himself, after the synod had condemned him, changed his philosophic habit, and used the same garb, that the secular presbyters wore." Which plainly evinces, that as yet the clergy in those parts did not distinguish themselves by their habit from other Christians, though the ascetics generally did. In the French Churches, several years after this, we find the clergy still using the same secular habit with other Christians. And when some endeavoured to alter it, and introduce the ascetic or philosophic habit among them, Celestine, bishop of Rome, wrote a repri-

---

[1] Con. Gangr. in Præfat. Ξένα ἀμφιάσματα ἐπὶ καταπτώσει τῆς κοινότητος τῶν ἀμφιασμάτων συνάγοντες. [2] Con. Gangr. c. 12. Εἴ τις ἀνδρῶν διὰ νομιζομένην ἄσκησιν περιβολαίῳ χρῆται, ὡς ἂν ἐκ τούτου τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἔχων, καταψηφίσοιτο τῶν μετ' εὐλαβείας τοὺς βήρους φορούντων, καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ κοινῇ καὶ ἐν συνηθείᾳ ὄσῃ ἐσθῆτι κεχρημένων, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. [3] Sozom. lib. iii. c. 14.

manding letter to them, asking,"[1] why that habit, the cloak, was used in the French Churches, when it had been the custom of so many bishops, for so many years, to use the common habit of the people? from whom the clergy were to be distinguished by their doctrine, and not by their garb; by their conversation, not their habit; by the purity of their souls, rather than their dress." But yet I must observe, that in some places the ascetics, when they were taken into the ministry of the Church, were allowed to retain their ancient philosophic habit without any censure. Thus St. Jerom[2] observes of his friend Nepotian, that he kept to his philosophic habit, the *Pallium*, after he was ordained presbyter, and wore it to the day of his death. He says the same of Heraclas,[3] presbyter of Alexandria, that he continued to use his philosophic habit, when he was presbyter. Which is noted also by Eusebius, out of Origen, who says,[4] "that when Heraclas entered himself in the school of philosophy, under Ammonius, he then laid aside the common garb, and took the philosophic habit, with which he sat in the presbytery of Alexandria." Upon which Valesius very rightly observes,[5] "that there was then no peculiar habit of the clergy, forasmuch as Heraclas always retained his philosophic *Pallium;* which was the known habit of the ascetics, but as yet was very rarely used among the clergy, who wore generally the common habit, except when some such philosophers and ascetics came among them." For here we see it was noted as something rare and singular in Heraclas: but in after ages, when the clergy were chiefly chosen out of the monks and ascetics, the philosophic habit came in by degrees with them, and was encouraged, till at last it became the most usual habit of

---

[1] Celestin. Ep. 2. ad Episc. Gall. c. 1. Unde hic habitus in Ecclesiis Gallicanis, ut tot annorum, tantorumque pontificum in alterum habitum consuetudo vertatur? Discernendi à plebe vel cæteris sumus doctrinâ, non veste; conversatione, non habitu; mentis puritate, non cultu. [2] Hieron. Epitaph. Nepotian. [3] Hieron. de Scriptor. c. 54. Heraclam, Presbyterum, qui sub habitu philosophi perseverabat, &c. [4] Orig. ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 19. Πρότερον κοινῇ ἐσθήτι χρώμενος, ἀποδυσάμενος ἐν φιλόσοφον ἀναλαβὼν σχῆμα μεχρὶ τοῦ δεῦρο τηρεῖ. [5] Vales. Not. in Loc. Ex his apparet, nullum etiam tum peculiarem fuisse vestitum Clericorum, quandoquidem Heraclas philosophicum pallium semper retinuit.

the clergy of all sorts. But this was not till the fifth or sixth century, as may be collected from what has been said before on this subject.

SECT. 20.—Of the *Collobium*, *Dalmatica*, *Caracalla*, *Hemiphorium*, and *Linea*.

But some perhaps may think, the clergy had always a distinct habit, because some ancient authors take notice of the *Collobium*, as a garment worn by bishops and presbyters in the primitive ages. For Epiphanius speaking of Arius, while he was presbyter of Alexandria, says,[1] he always wore the *Collobium* or *Hemiphorium*. And Pius, bishop of Rome, in his Epistle to Justus, bishop of Vienna, which by many is reckoned genuine, speaks[2] of Justus as wearing a *Collobium* also. But this was no more than the *Tunica*, of which there were two sorts, the *Dalmatica* and *Collobium*, which differed only in this respect, that the *Collobium* was the short coat without long sleeves, so called from Κολοβὸς, *curtus;* but the *Dalmatica* was the *Tunica manicata et talaris, the long coat with sleeves.* Both which were used by the Romans, though the *Collobium* was the more common, ancient, and honourable garment. As appears from Tully,[3] who derides Catiline's soldiers, because they had their *tunicæ manicatæ et talares;* whereas the ancient Romans were used to wear the *Collobia*, or *short coats without long sleeves;* as Servius[4] and St. Jerom[5] after him observe from this place of Tully. So that a bishop's or a presbyter's wearing a *Collobium*, means no more, when the hard name is explained, but their wearing a common Roman garment. Which is evident from one of the laws of Theodosius the Great, made about the habits, which senators were allowed to use within the walls of Constantinople,

---

[1] Epiph. Hær. 69. Arian. n. 3. Ἡμιφόριον γὰρ ὁ τοιῶτος ἀεὶ, ᾗ κολλοβίωνα ἐνδιδυσκόμενος. [2] Pius Ep. 2. ad Just. Vien. Tu verò apud senatoriam Viennam - - - Collobio Episcoporum vestitus, &c. [3] Cicer. Orat. 2. in Catalin. n. 22. [4] Servius in Virgil. 9. Æneid. v. 616. Et tunicæ manicas, et habent redimicula mitræ. [5] Hieron. Quæst. Hebraic. in Genes. 37. 32. Tom. iii. p. 222. Pro variâ tunicâ Symmachus interpretatus est tunicam manicatam; sive quod ad talos usque descenderet, sive quod haberet manicas; antiqui enim magis collobiis utebantur.

where they are forbidden[1] to wear the soldier's coat, the *Chlamys*, but allowed to use the *Collobium* and *Penula*, because these were civil habits, and vestments of peace.

The *Dalmatica*, or as it was otherwise called Χειρόδοτος, or *Tunica manicata*, because it had sleeves down to the hands, was seldom used among the Romans; for Lampridius notes it,[2] as a singular thing in the life of Commodus, the emperor, that he wore a *Dalmatica* in public; which he also[3] censures in Heliogabalus, as Tully had done before in Cataline. And that is a good argument to prove, that the clergy of this age did not wear the *Dalmatica* in public, since it was not then the common garment of the Romans. And the conjecture of a learned man[4] is well grounded, who thinks, "that in the life of St. Cyprian, where the ancient copies have, *tunicam tulit*, some officious modern transcribers changed the word, *Tunica*, into *Dalmatica*, as being more agreeable to the language and custom of their own time, when the *Dalmatica* was reckoned among the sacred vestments of the Church, though we never find it mentioned as such in any ancient author."

The *Caracalla*, which some now call the *cassoc*, was originally a Gallic habit, which Antonius Bassianus, who was born at Lyons in France, first brought into use among the Roman people, whence he had the name of Caracalla, as Aurelius Victor,[5] informs us. It was a long garment, reaching down to the heels, which Victor says the Roman people put on, when they went to salute the emperor. But whether it was also a clerical habit in those days, may be questioned, since no ancient author speaks of it as such: but if it was, it was not any peculiar habit of the clergy;

---

[1] Cod. Theod. lib. xiv. tit. 10. de Habitu quo uti oportet intra Urbem. leg. 1. Nullus Senatorum habitum sibi vindicet militarem, sed chlamydis terrore deposito, quieta colloborum ac penularum induat vestimenta, &c. [2] Lamprid. Vit. Commodi. p. 139. Dalmaticatus in publico processit. [3] Id. Vit. Heliogab. p. 317. Dalmaticatus in publico post cœnam sæpè visus est.
[4] Bp. Fell. Not. in Vit. Cypr. p. 13. [5] Victor. Epit. Vit. Caracallæ. Cùm è galliâ vestem plurimam devexisset, talaresque caracallas fecisset, coegissetque plebem ad se salutandum indutam talibus introire, de nomine hujus vestis, Caracalla cognominatus est.

since Spartian,[1] who lived in the time of Constantine, says, they were then used by the common people of Rome, who called them, *Caracallæ Antoninianæ* from their author.

The Ἡμιφόριον, which Epiphanius joins with the *Collobium*, was either but another name for the same garment, or one like it; for it signifies a short cloak or coat, as Petavius[2] and other critics explain it, Ἥμισυ Ἱματείας, or *Dimidium Pallium*, which answers to the description of the *Collobium* given before.

As for the *Linea* mentioned in the Life of Cyprian, which Baronius calls the bishop's rochet, it seems to have been no more than some common garment made of linen, though we know not what other name to give it. Baronius says pleasantly, "it was not his shirt," and therefore concludes it must be his rochet; which is an argument to make a reader smile, but carries no great conviction in it. And yet it is as good as any that he produces to prove, that bishops in Cyprian's time appeared in public differently habited from other men.

That the clergy had their particular habits for ministering in divine service, at least in the beginning of the fourth century, is not denied, but will be proved and evidenced in its proper place; but that any such distinction was generally observed *Extra Sacra* in their other habits in that age, is what does not appear, but the contrary, from what has been discoursed. It was necessary for me to give the reader this caution, because some unwarily confound these things together, and allege the proofs or disproofs of the one for the other, which yet are of very different consideration.

---

[1] Spartian. Vit. Caracal. p. 251. Ipse Caracallæ nomen accepit à vestimento quod populo dederat, demisso usque ad talos, quod ante non fuerat; unde hodiequè Antoninianæ dicuntur Caracallæ hujusmodi, in usu maximè Romanæ Plebis frequentatæ. [2] Petav. Not. in Epiphan. Hær. 69. n. 3. Suicer. Thesaur Eccles. tom. i. p. 1334.

CHAP. V.

Some Reflections upon the foregoing Discourse, concluding with an Address to the Clergy of the present Church.

Sect. 1.—Reflection 1. All Laws and Rules of the Ancient Church not necessary to be observed by the Present Church and Clergy.

Having thus far gone over, and as it were brought into one view, the chief of those ancient laws and rules, which concerned the elections, qualifications, duties, and general offices of the primitive clergy; reserving the consideration of particular offices to their proper places, I shall close this part of the discourse with a few necessary reflections upon it, in reference to the practice of the clergy of the present Church. And here first of all it will be proper to observe, that all the laws and rules of the primitive Church are not obligatory to the present clergy, save only so far as they either contain matters necessary in themselves, or are adopted into the body of rules and canons, which are authorized and received by the present Church. For some laws were made upon particular reasons, peculiar to the state and circumstances of the Church in those times; and it would neither be reasonable nor possible, to reduce men to the observance of all such laws, when the reasons of them are ceased, and the state of affairs and circumstances of the Church are so much altered. Other laws were made by particular Churches for themselves only, and these never could oblige other Churches, till they were received by their own consent, or bound upon them by the authority of a general-council, where they themselves were represented, and their consent virtually taken. Much less can they oblige absolute and independent Churches at the distance of so many ages; since every such Church has power to make laws and rules about things of an alterable nature for herself, and is not tied to the laws of any other. Nor consequently are any of the members of such a Church bound to observe those rules, unless they be revived and put in force by the Church, whereof they are members. As this

is agreeable to the sense and practice of the Catholic Church; so it was necessary here to be observed, that no one might mistake the design of this discourse, as if it tended to make every rule, that has been mentioned therein, become necessary and obligatory; or designed to reflect upon the present Church, because in all things she does not conform to the primitive practice; which it is not possible to do, without making all cases and circumstances exactly the same in all ages.

SECT 2.—Reflection 2. Some ancient Rules would be of excellent use, if revived by just Authority.

But secondly, notwithstanding this, I may, I presume, without offence take leave to observe in the next place, that some ancient rules would be of excellent use, if they were revived by just authority in the present Church. What if we had a law agreeable to that of Justinian's in the civil law, that every patron or elector, who presents a clerk, should depose upon oath, that he chose him neither for any gift, or promise, or friendship, or any other cause, but because he knew him to be a man of the true Catholic Faith, and good life, and good learning? Might not this be a good addition to the present laws against simoniacal contracts? What if the order of the ancient *Chorepiscopi* were reduced and settled in large dioceses? and coadjutors in case of infirmity and old age? Might not these be of great use, as for many other ends, so particularly for the exercise of discipline, and the easier and constant discharge of that most excellent office of confirmation? the judicious reader will be able to carry this reflection through abundance of other instances, which I need not here suggest. And I forbear the rather, because I am only acting the part of an historian for the ancient Church; leaving others, whose province it is, to make laws for the present Church, if any things are here suggested, which their wisdom and prudence may think fit to make the matter of laws for the greater benefit and advantage of it.

Sect. 3.—Reflection 3. Some ancient Laws may be complied with, though not Laws of the present Church.

Thirdly. It may be observed further, that there were some laws in the ancient Church, which, though they be not established laws of the present Church, may yet innocently be complied with; and perhaps it would be for the honour and advantage of the clergy voluntarily to comply with them, since there is no law to prohibit that. I will instance in one case of this nature. It was a law in the ancient Church, as I have showed,[1] that the clergy should end all their civil controversies, which they had one with another, among themselves, and not go to law in a secular court, unless they had a controversy with a layman. Now, though there be no such law in the present Church, yet there is nothing to hinder clergymen from choosing bishops to be their arbitrators, and voluntarily referring all their causes to them, or any other judges, whom they shall agree upon among themselves; which must be owned to be the most Christian way of ending controversies. Whence, as I have showed, it was many times practised by the laity in the primitive Church, who took bishops for their arbitrators by voluntary compromise, obliging themselves to stand to their arbitration. And what was so commendable in the laity, must needs be more reputable in the clergy, and more becoming their gravity and character; not to mention other advantages, that might arise from this way of ending disputes, rather than any other. From this one instance it will be easy to judge, how far it may be both lawful aud honourable, for the clergy to imitate the practice of the ancients, in other cases of the like nature.

Sect. 4.—Reflection 4. Of the Influence of great Examples, and Laws of perpetual Obligation.

Fourthly. The last observation, I have to make upon the foregoing discourse, is in reference to such laws of the ancient Church, as must be owned to be of necessary and eternal obligation. Such are most of those, that have been mentioned in the second and third chapters of this book,

[1] Book v. chap. i. sect. 4.

relating to the life and duties of the clergy; in which the clergy of all Churches will for ever be concerned, the matter of those laws being in itself of absolute and indispensible obligation. The practice of the ancients, therefore, in compliance with such laws, will be a continual admonition, and their examples a noble provocation to the clergy of all ages. There is nothing, that commonly moves or affects us more, than great and good examples; they at once both pleasantly instruct, and powerfully excite us to the practice of our duty; they show us, that rules are practicable, as having already been observed by men of like passions with ourselves; they are apt to inflame our courage by an holy contagion, and raise us to noble acts by provoking our emulation; they, as it were, shame us into laudable works, by upbraiding and reproaching our defects in falling short of the patterns set before us; they work upon our modesty, and turn it into zeal; they raise our several useful passions, and set us to work by exciting those inbred sparks of emulation, and principles of activity, that are lodged within us. And for this reason, whilst others have done good service by writing of the pastoral office and care, in plain rules and directions, I have added the examples of the ancients to their rules; the better to excite us to tread those paths, which are chalked out to us, by the encouragement of such instructive and provoking examples. Who can read that brave defence and answer,[1] which St. Basil made to the Arian prefect, without being warmed with something of his zeal for truth upon any the like occasion? How resolute and courageous will it make a man, even against the calumnies of spite and malice, to contend for the Faith, when he reads[2] what base slanders and reproaches were cast upon the greatest luminaries of the Church, and the best of men, Athanasius and Basil, for standing up in the cause of religion against the Arian heresy? Again, how peaceable, how candid, how ingenuous and prudent will it make a man in composing unnecessary disputes, that arise among Catholics in the Church, always to have before his eyes that great example of candour and peaceableness, which

[1] See book vi, chap. iii, sect. 10. [2] Ibid.

Nazianzen describes in the person of Athanasius,[1] who, by his prudence, reconciled two contending parties, that for a few syllables and a dispute about mere words had like to have torn the Church in pieces? To instance but once more,—who that reads that great example of charity and self-denial in the African Fathers at the Collation of Carthage,[2] and considers with what a brave and public spirit they despised their own private interest for the good, and peace, and unity of the Church, will not be inspired with something of the same noble temper, and ardent love of Christ; which will make him willing to do or suffer any thing for the benefit of his Church, and sacrifice his own private interest to the advantage of the public; whilst he persuades himself with those holy fathers, that he was made for the Church of Christ, and not the Church for him? As it is of the utmost consequence to the welfare of the Church, to have these and the like virtues and graces planted in the hearts of her clergy; so among other means, that may be used for the promoting this end, there is none perhaps more likely to take effect, than the recommending such virtues by the powerful provocation of such noble examples. And he, that offers such images of virtue to public view, may at least be allowed to make the apology, which Sulpicius Severus[3] makes for his writing the Life of St. Martin:—*Etsi ipsi non viximus, ut aliis exemplo esse possimus; dedimus tamen operam, ne illi laterent, qui essent imitandi.*

SECT. 5.—Some particular Rules recommended to Observation. 1st, Relating to the ancient Method of training up Persons for the Ministry.

But, whilst I am so earnest in recommending the examples of the ancients, I must not forget to inculcate some of their excellent rules. Such as their laws about training up young men for the ministry, under the *Magister Disciplinæ*, whose business was to form their morals, and inure them to such studies, exercises, and practices, as would best qualify them for higher offices and services in the Church. This method of education being now changed into that of

[1] See book vi. chap. iii. sect. 9. [2] Ibid. chap. iv. sect. 2. [3] Sever. de Vit. S. Martin. in Prologo.

universities, and schools of learning, it highly concerns them, on whom this care is devolved, to see that the same ends however be answered, that is, that all young men, who aspire to the sacred profession, be rightly formed, both in their studies and morals, to qualify them for their great work and the several duties of their calling. And they are the more concerned to be careful in this matter, because bishops now cannot have that personal knowledge of the morals of such persons, as they had formerly, when they were trained up under their eye, and liable to their inspection; but now, as to this part of their qualification, they must depend first upon the care, and then upon the testimony of those, who are instructed with their education. Besides a late eminent writer,[1] who inquires into the causes of the present corruption of Christians, where he has occasion to speak of the pastoral office, and the ordinary methods now used for training up persons to it, makes a double complaint of the way of education in several of the universities of Europe. As to manners, he complains, "that young people live there licentiously, and are left to their own conduct, and make public profession of dissoluteness:—nay, that they not only live there irregularly, but have privileges, which give them a right to commit with impunity all manner of insolencies, brutalities, and scandals, and which exempt them from the magistrates' jurisdiction." Now such universities, as are concerned in this accusation, which by the blessing of God those of our land are not, have great reason to consider how far they are fallen from the primitive standard, and what a difference there is between the ancient way of educating under the inspection of a bishop, and the conduct of a master of discipline in every Church, and the way of such academies; where, if that learned person say true, "the care of masters and professors does not extend to the regulating of the manners of their disciples." The other complaint he makes is in reference to the studies, which are pursued at universities, in which he observes two faults, one in reference to the method of teaching. "Divinity is treated there, and the Holy Scripture

[1] Ostervald's Causes of the Corruption of Christians, par. ii. c. 3. p. 333.

explained altogether in a scholastical and speculative manner. Common places are read, which are full of school terms, and of questions not very material. This makes young men resolve all religion into controversies, and gives them intricate and false notions of divinity." The other fault, he thinks, is more essential. "Little or no care is taken to teach those, who dedicate themselves to the service of the Church, several things, the knowledge of which would be very necessary to them. The study of history and of Church antiquity is neglected, morality is not taught in divinity-schools, but in a superficial and scholastic manner; and in many academies it is not taught at all. They seldom speak there of discipline, they give few or no instructions concerning the manner of exercising the pastoral care, or of governing the Church. So that the greater part of those, who are admitted into this office, enter into it without knowing wherein it consists; all the notion they have of it is, that it is a profession, which obliges them to preach and to explain texts." I cannot think all universities are equally concerned in this charge, nor shall I inquire how far any are, but only say, that the faults here complained of were rarely to be met with in the methods of education in the primitive Church; where, as I have showed, the chief studies of men devoted to the service of the Church, both before and after their ordinations, were such as directly tended to instruct them in the necessary duties and offices of their function. The great care then was to oblige men carefully to study the Scriptures in a practical way, and to acquaint themselves with the history, and laws, and discipline of the Church, by the knowledge and exercise of which they became expert in all the arts of curing souls, and making pious and holy men, which is the business of spiritual physicians, and the whole of the pastoral office; in which therefore their rules and examples are proper to be proposed to all Churches for their imitation.

SECT. 6.—2dly. Their Rules for examining the Qualifications of Candidates for the Ministry.

Another sort of rules, worthy our most serious thoughts and consideration, were those, which concerned the exami-

nation of the candidates for the ministry. For by these such methods were prescribed, and such caution used, that it was scarce possible for an unfit or immoral man to be admitted to an ecclesiastical office, unless a bishop and the whole Church combined, as it were, to choose unworthy men, which was a case that very rarely happened. It was a peculiar advantage in the primitive Church, that by her laws ordinarily none were to be ordained but in the Church, where they were personally known; so that their manners and way of living might be most strictly canvassed and examined; and a vicious man could not be ordained, if either the bishop or the Church had the courage to reject him. Now though this rule cannot be practised in the present state of the Church, yet the main intent of it is of absolute necessity to be answered, and provided for some other way; else the Church must needs suffer greatly, and infinitely fall short of the purity of the primitive Church, by conferring the most sacred of all characters upon immoral and unworthy men. The only way, which our present circumstances will admit of, to answer the caution that was used in former days, is to certify the bishop, concerning the candidates' known probity and integrity of life, by such testimonials as he may safely depend upon. Here therefore every one sees, without my observing it to him, that to advance the present Church to the purity and excellency of the primitive Church, there is need of the utmost caution in this matter; that testimonials in so weighty an affair be not promiscuously granted unto all; nor to any but upon reasonable evidence and assurance of the things testified therein: otherwise we partake in other men's sins, and are far from consulting truly the glory of God, and the good of his Church, whilst we deviate so much from the exactness and caution, that is showed us in the primitive pattern.

The other part of the examination of candidates, which related to their abilities and talents, was made with no less diligence and exactness. The chief inquiry was, whether they were well versed in the sense and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; whether they rightly understood the fundamentals of religion, the necessary doctrines of the Gospel, and the rules of morality, as delivered in the law of

God; whether they had been conversant in the history of the Church, and understood her laws and discipline; and were men of prudence to govern, as well as of ability to teach the people committed to their charge. These were things of great importance, because most of them were of daily use in the exercise of the ministry and pastoral care; and therefore proper to be insisted on in examinations of this nature. These were the qualifications, which, joined with the burning and shining light of a pious life, raised the primitive Church and clergy to that height of glory, which we all profess to admire in them. And the very naming that is a sufficient provocation to such, as are concerned in this matter, to express their zeal for the welfare and glory of the present Church, by keeping strictly to the measures, which were so successfully observed in the ancient Church; and without which the ends of the ministry cannot be fully attained in any Church, whilst persons are ordained that want proper qualifications.

SECT. 7.—3dly. Their Rules about private Address, and the Exercise of private Discipline.

I shall not now stand to inculcate any other rules about particular duties, studying, preaching, or the like, but only beg leave to recommend the primitive pattern in two things more. The one concerns private pastors, the other is humbly offered to the governors of the Church. That, which concerns private pastors, is the duty of private address, and the exercise of private discipline toward the people committed to their charge. Some eminent persons,[1] who have lately considered the duties of the pastoral office, reckon this one of the principal and most necessary functions of it; which consists in inspecting the lives of private persons, in visiting families, in exhortations, warnings, reproofs, instructions, reconciliations, and in all those other cares, which a pastor ought to take of those, over whom he is constituted. "For," as they rightly observe, "neither general exhortations, nor public discipline can answer all the occasions of the Church.

[1] Ostervald's Causes of the Corrupt. of Christians, p. 318. See also Bishop Burnet's Pastoral Care, c. viii. p. 96.

There are certain disorders, which pastors neither can, nor ought to repress openly, and which yet ought to be remedied by them. In such cases, private admonitions are to be used. The concern of men's salvation requires this, and it becomes the pastoral carefulness to seek the straying sheep, and not to let the wicked perish for want of warning." But now because this is a nice and difficult work, and requires not only great diligence and application, but also great art and prudence, with a proportionable share of meekness, moderation, and temper, to perform it aright; it is often either wholly neglected, or very ill performed; whilst some think it enough to admonish sinners from the pulpit, and others admonish them indiscreetly, which tends more to provoke, than reclaim them. To remedy both these evils, it will be useful to reflect upon that excellent discourse of Gregory Nazianzen, which has been suggested in the third chapter of this book,[1] where he considers that great variety of tempers, which is in men, and the nicety of all matters and occasions, that a skilful pastor ought to consider, in order to supply suitable remedies to every disemper. And there the reader will also find some other excellent cautions and directions given by Chrysostom and others upon this head, with examples proper to excite him to the performance of this necessary duty.

SECT. 8.—4thly. Their Rules for exercising Public Discipline upon Delinquent Clergymen, who were convicted of scandalous Offences.

The other thing, I would humbly offer to the consideration of our superiors, who are the guardians of public discipline, and inspectors of the behaviour of private pastors, is the exercise of discipline in the ancient Church. By which I do not now mean that general discipline, which was exercised toward all offenders in the Church, but the particular discipline, that was used among the clergy; by virtue of which every clerk convicted of immorality, or other scandalous offence, was liable to be deposed, and punished with other ecclesiastical censures; of which, both crimes and punishments, I have given a particular account in the three

[1] See Book vi. chap. 3. sect. 8.

foregoing chapters of this Book. It is a thing generally acknowledged by all, that the glory of the ancient Church was her discipline; and it is as general a complaint of the misfortune of the present Church, that corruptions abound for want of reviving and restoring the ancient discipline. Now, if there be any truth in either of these observations, it ought to be a quickening argument to all, that sit at the helm of government in the Church, to bestir themselves with their utmost zeal, that discipline, where it is wanting, may at least be restored among the clergy; that no scandals or offences may be tolerated among them, whose lives and practices ought to be a light and a guide to others. As there is nothing to hinder the free exercise of it here, so it is but fitting it should be exemplified in them; as for many other reasons, so particularly for this, that the laity may not think, they are to be tied to any discipline, which the clergy have not first exercised upon themselves with greater severity of ecclesiastical censures. And if either rules or examples can encourage this, those of the primitive Church are most provoking; her rules of discipline were most excellent and exact in themselves, and for the most part, as exactly managed by persons intrusted with the execution of them.

SECT. 9.—Julian's Design to reform the Heathen Priests by the Rules of the Primitive Clergy, an Argument to provoke our Zeal in the present Age.

After these reflections, made upon the laws and practice of the primitive clergy, it will be needless to make any long address to any orders of the clergy of the present age. I will therefore only observe one thing more, that Julian's design to bring the laws of the primitive clergy into use among the heathen priests, in order to reform them, as it was then a plain testimony of their excellency, so it is now a proper argument to provoke the zeal of the present clergy, to be more forward and ambitious in their imitation. I have already in part recited Julian's testimony and design, out of his Letter to Arsacius, high priest of Galatia; I shall here subjoin a more ample testimony from a fragment of one of his Epistles[1] printed among his Works, where, speaking of

[1] Julian. Fragment. Epist. p. 542.

the gentile priests, he says, "It was reasonable they should be honoured, as the ministers and servants of the gods, by whose mediation many blessings were derived from heaven upon the world; and so long as they retained this character, they were to be honoured and respected by all, but if wicked and vicious, they should be deposed from their office, as unworthy their function.[1] Their lives were to be so regulated, as that they might be a copy and pattern of what they were to preach to men. To this purpose they should be careful in all their addresses to the gods, to express all imaginable reverence and piety, as being in their presence, and under their inspection.[2] They should neither speak a filthy word, nor hear one; but abstain as well from all impure discourse, as vile and wicked actions, and not let a scurrilous or abusive jest come from their mouths. They should read no books tending this way, such as Archilochus and Hipponax, and the writers of loose wanton comedies; but apply themselves to the study of such philosophers, as Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Chrysippus, and Zeno, whose writings were most likely to create piety in men's minds. For all sorts of books were not fit to be read by the priests. Even among philosophers, those of Pyrrho and Epicurus were wholly to be rejected by them; and instead of these they[3] should learn such divine hymns, as were to be sung in honour of the gods, to whom they should make their supplications publicly and privately thrice a day, if it might be; however twice at least, morning and evening. In the course of their public ministrations[4] in the temples, which, at Rome, commonly held for thirty days, they were to reside all the time in the temples, and give themselves to philosophic thoughts, and neither go to their own houses, nor into the forum, nor see any magistrate but in the temple. When their term of waiting was expired, and they were returned home, they might not converse or feast promiscuously with all, but only with their friends and the best of men; they were but rarely then to appear in the forum, and not to visit the magistrates and rulers, except it were in

[1] Julian. Fragment. Epist. p. 543. [2] Ibid. p. 547. [3] Ibid. p. 551.
[4] Ibid. p. 553.

order to be helpful to some that needed their assistance. While they ministered in the temple, they were to be arrayed with a magnificent garment; but out of it they must wear common apparel, and that not very costly, or in the least savouring of pride and vain glory. They were in no case[1] to go to see the obscene and wanton shows of the public theatres, nor to bring them into their own houses, nor to converse familiarly with any charioteer, or player, or dancer, belonging to the theatre." After this he signifies, out of what sort of men the priests should be chosen. "They should be the best that could be found in every city, persons that had true love for god and man, and then it mattered not whether they were rich or poor; there being no difference to be made between noble and ignoble in this case. No one was to be rejected upon other accounts, who was endued with those two qualities, piety to god, and humanity to men. Whereof the former might be evidenced by their care to make all their domestics as devout as themselves; and the latter, by their readiness to distribute liberally to the poor, out of that little they had, and extending their charity to as many as was possible. And there was the more reason to be careful in this matter, because it was manifestly the neglect of this humanity in the priests, which had given occasion to the impious Galileans, by whom he means the Christians, to strengthen their party by the practice of that humanity, which the others neglected. For as kidnappers steal away children, whom they first allure with a cake; so these begin first to work upon honest-hearted gentiles with their love-feasts, and entertainments, and ministering of tables, as they call them, till at last they pervert them to atheism, and impiety against the gods."

Now, from this discourse of Julian, I think it is very evident, that he had observed what laws and practices had chiefly contributed to the advancement of the character and credit of the Christian clergy, and of the Christian religion by their means; and therefore he laboured to introduce the

[1] Julian. Fragment. Epist. p. 555.

like rules and discipline among the idol-priests, and intended to have made many other alterations in the heathen customs, in compliance with the envied rites and usages of the Christian religion, as is observed both by Gregory Nazianzen[1] and Sozomen,[2] who give us a particular account of his intended emendations; the very mentioning which, if I mistake not, is a loud call to us, to be at least as zealous, as Julian was, in copying out such excellencies of the primitive clergy, as are proper for our imitation. It is the argument, which the Apostle makes use of in a like case:—"I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, by a foolish nation will I anger you." Rom. x. 19. I must needs say, it will be but a melancholy consideration for any man to find hereafter, that the zeal of an apostate heathen shall rise up in judgment against him, and condemn him.

SECT. 10.—The Conclusion, by way of Address to the Clergy of the present Church.

We all profess, as it is our duty to do, a great zeal for the honour and welfare of the present Church. Now, if indeed we have that zeal which we profess, we shall be careful to demonstrate it in all our actions; observing those necessary rules and measures, which raised the primitive Church to its glory. We are obliged, in this respect, first, to be strict and exemplary in our lives; to set others a pattern of sobriety, humility, meekness, charity, self-denial, and contempt of the world, and all such common graces, as are required of Christians in general to adorn their profession; and then to add to these the peculiar graces and ornaments of our function, diligence, prudence, fidelity, and piety in the whole course of our ministry; imitating those excellencies of the Ancients, which have been described; confining ourselves to the proper business of our calling, and not intermeddling or distracting ourselves with other cares; employing our thoughts and time in useful studies, and directing them to their proper end, the edification of the Church; performing all divine offices with assiduity and constancy, and in that rational, decent, and becoming way,

[1] Naz. Invect. I. in Julian. [2] Sozom. lib. v. c. 16.

as suits the nature of the action; making our addresses to God with a serious reverence, and an affecting fervency of devotion; and in our discourses to men, speaking always, as the oracles of God, with Scripture eloquence, which is the most persuasive; in our doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned; in our reproofs, and the exercise of public and private discipline, using great wisdom and prudence, both to discern the tempers of men, and to time the application to its proper season, mixing charity and compassion with a just severity, and endeavouring to restore fallen brethren in the spirit of meekness; showing gentleness and patience to them that are in error, and giving them good arguments with good usage, in order to regain them; avoiding all bitter and contumelious language, and never bringing against any man a railing accusation; treating those of our own order, whether superiors, inferiors, or equals, with all the decency and respect that is due to them, since nothing is more scandalous among clergymen than the abuses and contempt of one another; endeavouring here, as well as in all other cases, "to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace;" showing ourselves candid and ingenuous in moderating disputes among good Catholics, as well as resolute and prudent in opposing the malicious designs of the professed enemies of truth; briefly, employing our thoughts day and night upon these things, turning our designs this way, and always acting with a pure intention for the benefit and edification of the Church; even neglecting our own honours, and despising our own interest, when it is needful for the advantage of the public.

Such actions will proclaim our zeal indeed, and draw every eye to take notice of it. Such qualities, joined with probity and integrity of life, will equal our character to that of the primitive saints; and either give happy success to our labours, or at least crown our endeavours with the comfort and satisfaction of having discharged a good conscience in the sight of God. The best designs indeed may be frustrated, and the most pious and zealous endeavours be disappointed. It was so with our Lord and Master himself, and no one of his household then is to think it strange, if it

happen to be his own case. For, "though he spake as never man spake;" though he had done so many miracles among the Jews, yet they believed not on him. This seems to be written for our comfort, that we should not be wholly dejected, though our endeavours fail of success, since our Lord himself was first pleased to take his share in the disappointment. It will still be our comfort, that we can be able to say with the prophet in this case, "Though we have laboured in vain, and spent our strength for nought, yet surely our judgment is with the Lord, and our work with our God. And then though Israel be not gathered, yet shall we be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and our God shall be our strength." Isai. xlix. 4, 5.

END OF VOL. I.

BINGHAM, Printer,
14, Tavistock-street, Covent-garden.

NOV 7 - 1928